

# HISTORY OF CLASSICAL SANSKRIT LITERATURE

Being an elaborate account of all branches of Classical  
Sanskrit Literature, with full Epigraphical and  
Archaeological Notes and References, an  
Introduction dealing with Language,  
Philology and Chronology and  
Index of Authors and  
Works

KAVYAVINODA, SAHITYARATNAKARA  
M. KRISHNAMACHARIAR, M.A., M.L., Ph.D.  
Member of the Royal Asiatic Society of London.  
(*Of the Madras Judicial Service*)

ASSISTED BY HIS SON  
M. SRINIVASACHARIAR, B.A., B.L.  
ADVOCATE, MADRAS

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS  
DELHI :: PATNA :: VARANASI

©MOTILAL BANARSIDASS

Indological Publishers & Booksellers

Head Office : BUNGALOW ROAD, JAWAHAR NAGAR, DELHI-7

Branches : 1. CHOWK, VARANASI-1 (U.P.)

2. ASHOK RAJPATH, PATNA-4 (BIHAR)

*First Edition* : 1937

Second Edition : Delhi, 1970

Third Edition : Delhi, 1974

**Price : Rs. 80.00**

Printed in India

BY SHANTILAL JAIN, AT EHRI JAINENDRA PRESS, BUNGALOW ROAD, JAWAHAR  
NAGAR, DELHI-7 AND PUBLISHED BY SUNDARLAL JAIN, FOR MOTILAL  
BANARSIDASS, BUNGALOW ROAD, JAWAHAR NAGAR, DELHI-7

**TO THE MEMORY  
OF  
MY DEAR MOTHER AMRTAMBA**

अमृतवाहि

जननि नमस्ते

वत्सेति वत्सेति समाह्वयन्ती

परामृशन्ती सदयं करेण ।

कालेन नीताममृतत्वमम्बां

ध्यायामि सन्ध्यासु वरेण्यशुचाम् ॥





ओं नमः  
श्रियःपतये



अखिलभुवनजन्मस्थेममङ्गादिलोके  
विविधविगतभूतत्रातर्क्षैकदीक्षे ।  
श्रुतिशिरसि विदीप्ते ब्रह्मणि श्रीनिवासे  
भवतु मम परस्मिन् शेषुषी भक्तिरूपा ॥

महाकविवचस्त्रुधाप्रसरसौरभोल्लामिता  
महाहैगुणनाथकप्रथितवृत्तमुक्तोत्तज्ज्वला ।  
महामहिमदेवतास्तवनहृद्यरत्नाङ्किता  
वृषाद्रिपतिपादशोस्सुतनुरर्पितेयं कृतिः ॥



## PREFACE

LOOK AT THIS DEDICATION TO LORD SRI VENKATESVARA! That will remind you of the Glory and Purpose of His Manifestation in this world of sin and exalt you to the region of the blessed and the immortal. With a salutation to the great Sages Vālmīki and Vyāsa, the work begins and gives an elaborate account of Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata and Purāṇas, with all their recensions, editions and commentaries. The vast expanse of Classical Sanskrit Literature has been arranged on the model of standard works on foreign literature. The main classes are three, Śravyakāvya, Ḍṛśyakāvya and Sāhitya. First come the poems proper, of two classes, major and minor, (Śravyakāvya)—, which is all verse, or all prose or mixed prose and verse with all their minor varieties, topical and ingenious. Secondly comes the drama (Ḍṛśyakāvya) in all its technical ramifications and with all motifs temporal, spiritual and allegorical. Next is science of poetry (Sāhitya) in its widest sense embracing rhetoric, dancing, music and erotics. To this is appended a chapter on Prosody or metrics (Chandas). All topics are introduced by an exposition of the rhetorical definitions and theorisations and treated from their traceable beginnings, which to some extent are traditional and theological; but I would not call them 'mythical' implying a stigma of falsity and fiction. As far as it was in my reach, all that has been said about any author or work anywhere in books, journals or papers has been entered in the references and this will help special studies. Dynasties of Kings that ruled in India in different parts and at different times have been fully honored by a collation of relevant notes, epigraphical and archaeological, not merely because the kings were the fountains of literature, but many of them were themselves poets of celebrity. Works known and unknown, lost and extant, printed and unprinted, catalogued and uncatalogued, have all been mentioned and in many cases the stray places where they are still available in manuscript. Above all there is the quotation of gems of poetry of varying interest from amour and nature to devotion and renunciation, and these in themselves are an anthology of meritorious specimens of poetic thought and expression.

The INTRODUCTION deals with several topics of general interest allied to the study of Classical Sanskrit Literature ; such for instance is the spiritual origin and aspect of language as envisaged in the Vedas and as elaborated by schools of Grammarians, the progress of structural and linguistic changes in the expression of the Sanskrit language, from Chanḍas to Bhāṣa, and the like ; this will assist the study of Comparative Philology, of which "*The Discovery of Sanskrit*" is acknowledged to be the origin. Of foremost importance, there is the subject of Indian Chronology. India has its well written history and the Purāṇas exhibit that history and chronology. To the devout Hindu and to a Hindu who will strive to be honest in the literary and historical way, Purāṇas are not ' pious frauds.' In the hands of many Orientalists, India has lost (or has been cheated out of) a period of 10-12 centuries in its political and literary life, by the assumption of a faulty Synchronism of Candragupṭa Maurya and Sandracottus of the Greek works and all that can be said against that "*Anchor-Sheet of Indian Chronology*" has been said in this Introduction. In the case of those early European Orientalists, very eminent and respectable in themselves, this thought of resemblance and historical synchronism was at least sincere, for it was very scanty material that they could work upon. But for their successors in that hierarchy who are mostly our "Professors of Indian History," that have given a longevity and a garb of truth to it by repetition, there is to my mind no excuse or expiation, if at all it be a confession of neglect and a recognition of India's glorious past in its entire truth.

The INDEX OF AUTHORS AND WORKS (in Sanskrit) is followed by a small supplement (in English) on miscellaneous matters. The Index is not merely a means of reference and indication, but embodies corrections and additions, so as to act as what is usually expressed as "Errata et Corrigenda et Addenda." Many authors and works that could not be mentioned in the body of the work, because they came to be known too late, are entered there. The reader will therefore take the Index as part of the main work and not merely as an easy appendix to it. In all, the number of works and authors would be some thousands, arranged alphabetically on the plan of Stein's Index to Kashmir Catalogue and Aufrecht's Catalogus Catalogorum. Recent and living authors have been, so far as I could get at, noticed, and this work, it is submitted with all humility, deals with the history of Classical Sanskrit Literature from the earliest times to the present day.

In the year 1906, I published a small book, History of Classical Sanskrit Literature. Being the first and only work of its comprehension, it was well received everywhere in our Universities and was quoted profusely in the publications of the Universities of the United States of America. I was often asked to reprint the book, but conscious of its inadequacy I did not do it, but in its stead I thought of a comprehensive work that would present at a glance the full vista of Sanskrit literary domain and that in the light of past historical researches. Even the ardent Pandit knows not the vast literature that has been lost or lies hidden in the libraries of India.

But what are your chances of using these libraries? Manuscripts and catalogues now out of print are all 'stored' in these receptacles. They may be there for years, unthought and untouched, save for changes of physical location. The pages may turn red, brown, blue and brittle, but they still lie uncut by the hand of any reader. The Guardian (Curator, Secretary, Librarian, call them as you please) will well watch these receptacles on their pedestals. The guardian will applaud your attempt at research and will promise to help it by a loan of books on your application, but he is "helpless" and must soon express his regret in reply as "rules are against loan." If you apply to a higher authority for relief, the paper runs through the regular channels to the same guardian, and on his report, after a lingering expectation, you get an order (a copy of the prior one) with a difference only in the preamble and the subscription. Libraries "are meant for visitors," but most of them do not look in, but look on, all the more so, if a museum or a house of curios is adjacent to the library. And these rare books are only rarely wanted and that by a incrustated antiquarian of my ilk. One that comes there does not need the book; one that is far away cannot get it. If you do go there, stealing a holiday, the key of a particular almirah where your wanted work is kept may be with the guardian who is away elsewhere. What then is a library for? It is not a Palace of Toys! Much of this tale was true of the Oriental Manuscripts Library of Madras some years ago, when I commenced the preparation of this work. I am not sure if at present the position is better. But I am aware that not many years ago, there was an indictment of the methods of this Library by His Holiness Śrī Yaśirājaswāmi in his preface to his edition of Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa. The expression of his chagrin, in language poetic, is well worth reading as a piece of excellent prose literature.

I wrote for information to libraries, I rarely had a reply, for some of these guardians have "no staff, no provision for paper or postage." If I asked for an extract from any manuscript—say the first and last few lines—some institutions demanded copying charges. I applied for a copy, the charges were exorbitant. For instance, for an indifferent copy in two quarter sheets of thirty-two anustubh verses (of 32 letters each) I was asked to pay about a rupee and postage. I paid and consoled myself by the thought that this fee went for the maintenance of a poor Pandit, and that it was in no way more rapacious than the fee charged recently by a Banker for giving an extract of a single line from a ledger, viz., Rs. 5 for search, Rs. 5 for copying the line, and Rs. 5 for adding a certificate that it was a 'true copy', and these charges are only made "according to rules." We have to get on 'under the rules'; no one cares to look into these iniquities. Equally so was it with many Professors of Colleges. They would have no time to reply and the few that deigned to oblige after reminders had very little to say. To trace an author and his affairs, I had in many cases to correspond with several persons, and only perseverance did win it. If the post office could exempt my letters from postage, it would give a different aspect, but alas, not. It is under these auspices I began and progressed. But I cannot refrain from expressing that the acquisition of the material gathered in this book has been too costly for an equanimous retrospect and I shall not be far wrong to say that each author, save those few that are too well known, cost me on an average four annas. I have often felt that it is not an enterprise that a prudent householder should have embarked upon, but it was too late to think of the folly.

Amidst official work in judicial service, in places distant from metropolis, there was little leisure for a continuous study. A few days snatched at intervals during the recesses of summer and other holidays were rarely sufficient for visits or references to libraries scattered all over India. After all the work was ready—ready in bulk—about 8 years ago. It went to print. After a year, it was carried away in the current of an estate that vested in the Official Assignee. A request and a claim got it out of the muddle. The Press was sold. Delay there was, but the printing was resumed. I fell ill and I raved about this work and its contents, astonishing the doctor what it was all about, though I thought I was lecturing sensibly on Sanskrit Literature. There was again a change in the management and there was another lull.

After sometime, the printing was taken up and slowly moved on. Once the manuscript of a whole chapter which was in the custody of a manager was lost—"said to be not sent at all"—but after all traced as 'misaid', after I re-wrote much of it from scanty material gathered again from memory. If with all these mishaps and vicissitudes the work took 20 years and more, need I say that the suspense is enough to dole dismay to a chronic optimist which I presumed that I was.

In the preparation of the work, I have had the fullest sympathy from all Universities (except probably the University of Madras) and all Local Governments and the Governments of Indian States and the Government of Ceylon. They have been magnanimous and let me have their Sanskrit and other publications free as presents and that has well nigh contributed to the fullness of the notes, literary, epigraphical and archæological. To them I am ever thankful. To Sjt. P. R. RAMA AIYAR, the Proprietor of Messrs. P. R. Rama Aiyar & Co., Booksellers, Madras, who with his selfless generosity first received this work in his Press for love of literary research, I express my first regard. Due to tortuous ways divine, his Press changed hands, but blest was it, that it became the Press of Sri Venkatesvara Devasthanam, Tirupati. At the hands of His Holiness SRI MAHANT PRAYAGA DOSSJEE VARU of Sri Hatheerāmjee Mutt, Tirupati, then its Vicharanakartha, I received a kindly appreciation; he directed that the printing part of the work be done free in the Press, a work that has been meant to be dedicated to Śrī Venkatesvara of Tirupati, at whose feet my family does humble hereditary service. When the management of the Devasthanam was assumed by the Committee appointed by the Local Legislature with its Commissioner, MR. K. SITARAMA REDDI, B.A., B.L., I was allowed to have the same concession with certain alterations. It is with this assistance and the particular interest which the present Commissioner, MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIAR, B.A., B.L., evinced in speeding up the printing, the work is now seeing its publication. To the Committee and the Commissioner, gratitude will ever be transcendent in my memory—all the more so because they are the custodians of the Wealth and Glory of LORD VENKATESVARA.

Owing to pressure of Official duties and the anxiety to see the end of the publication, which has been by various causes often impeded during the last eight years, errors of print have crept in, but I slyly feel that the learned eye of my loving reader will easily skip through the

faults and fleet over the matter aight. In this hope, and what is more fervent, in the hope that this labour of love will be received with all possible indulgence I venture to present these pages to the literary world.

TIRUPATI HILLS,  
TIRUPATI,  
*May 1937.*

M. KRISHNAMACHARIAR



## CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Introduction</i>	I-VI
<i>Abbreviations</i>	I
<i>Bibliography</i>	CXI
<i>Table of Transliteration</i>	CXVII
	CXXI

### BOOK I

<i>Chapters</i>			
I	Section 1	Vedic Forms of Epics..	1
	„ 2	Rāmāyaṇa ..	3
	„ 3	Mahābhārata ..	27
	„ 4	Epics Compared ..	64
	„ 5	Purāṇas ..	72
	„ 6	Tantras ..	78

### BOOK II

II	Kāvya	Kāvya ..	79
III—X		Mahākāvya ..	82
XI	Section 1	Laghukāvya ..	311
	„ 2	Nīti ..	313
	„ 3	Stotra ..	320
XII		Laghukāvya ( <i>contd.</i> ) ..	334
XIII		Sandēśa ..	358
XIV		Citrakāvya ..	369
XV		Subhāṣita ..	385
XVI	Section 1	Poetesses ..	391
	„ 2	Royal Poets ..	397
	„ 3	Unnamed Poets ..	404
XVII		Deśāvṛtta ..	407

## BOOK III

			<i>Page</i>
XVIII	Section 1	Kathānaka	.. 411
	„ 2	Bṛhatkathā	.. 412
	„ 3	Pañcatantra	.. 423
	„ 4	Other Tales	.. 428

## BOOK IV

XIX—XX	Gadyakāvya	.. 436
XXI	Campū	.. 496

## BOOK V

XXII	Dr̥śyakāvya	.. 525
------	-------------	--------

## BOOK VI

XXIII	Sāhityaśāstra	.. 707
XXIV	Alaṅkāra	.. 726
XXV	Bharata	.. 810
XXVI	Śaṅgīta	.. 832
XXVII	✓Kāmaśāstra	.. 877
XXVIII	Chandovicitī	.. 897
<i>Appendix</i>	Extracts from Avantisundarī-	
	kathā etc.	.. 913
<i>Index</i>		921
<i>Addenda &amp; Corrigenda</i>		1123

## CORRIGENDA (SUPPLEMENT)

For p. 274	read 271
„ „ 308	„ 308j

Numbers of pages from 960 onwards are wrongly printed.  
They should be read as 961 etc. in serial order.

अत्रेदं विज्ञाप्यते श्रीशेषशैलजनपदीनवासिना ग्रन्थकर्त्रा कृष्णेन—

पितृव्यपादानां श्रीमतां श्रीनिवासरङ्गनाथाचार्याणां सकाशे दासेन शैशवे लब्धः साहितीपरिचयलेशः । अतिक्रान्ते छात्रभावे बहुषु पत्तनेषु प्राड्विवाकपदव्यां प्रचलिता-धिष्ठानतया अस्मान्ते स्मन्दर्शितराजकीयधर्मशास्त्रविषयकबहुग्रन्थरचनया च गैर्वाणीं वाणीं यथाभिलषितं सुकृतिभिर्भवद्भिरिवासेविषुं न पारितं दासेन । तथापि पूर्वस्मिन् जन्मनि कृते-नावदातेन कर्मलेशेन शारदाया आराधने समुद्योजितो दासः संस्कृतकविकाव्यचरितप्रथ-मेन । तदप्यारब्धं समुचितसामर्थ्यहीनेनादूरदर्शिना दासेनेति विलसितं नियतिलीलायाः । अधुण एष पन्थाः । कियान्वा कविमुखेषु गीर्वाणवाणीप्रसर आसीदस्ति चेति प्राख्येण न जानन्ति बहवो विद्वांसः, विगलतया दर्शनीयानामाकराणामालयानां सूचीनां च । पर-स्सहस्राः पञ्चमहाकाव्यसदृशाः प्रबन्धाः निलीना विनीनाश्च । रूपकाणि च तथैव । केचन ग्रन्थाः कवयश्च नामावशिष्टाः कीर्तिशेषा एव । आशोस्यतामचिरात्तेऽपि दर्शनपथमवतर-न्तिवति ।

एष विंशतिवार्षिकः प्रयत्नः

अश्रुतादृष्टपूर्वविविधसाहित्यसाम्राज्यशोभना अखिलभारतवर्षीयकविवरेण्वचरित सुमनोगुम्फितेयं कृतिः सहता कुशेन धनज्ययेन च केवलया गीर्वाणवाणीपरिचरणयैव भगवत्या वाग्देव्याः प्रसादेन महतां चाशिषा परिसमाप्तिमागता ।

यथाज्ञातं यथाश्रुतं यत्रकुत्रापि व्याख्यातमुपक्षिप्तमुदाहृतं वा गुणावता कान्तेन दृष्टमदृष्टं श्रुतमश्रुतं मुद्रितममुद्रितं लब्धमलब्धं सर्वमपि कविकर्म कालतो देशतश्च विमृज्य स्क्-कमपीनिवृत्तं समारभ्यादिकाज्यान् अद्यावधि यावच्छक्यमत्र संमेलितम् । किंच उपोद्धाने च सुविपुले—सन्दर्भहाणो साहाय्यमुपवर्णिनम् । भाषाशास्त्रस्य देववाणीमातृत्वमुपदर्शितम् । पुराणेतिहासानां प्रामाण्यमुद्घोषितम् । तत्परिपन्थिनां वादानां दुष्टता च प्रकरिता । रस-विशिष्टाः वाग्विलासाः तत्र तत्र स्थानेषु समुचितेषु वाचिताः । यथा ग्रन्थ एष भविष्यति सुभाषितभाण्डागारः सहृदयाह्लादनाय ।

तथाश्रुतं प्रकृत्य महतां पादमूले समर्थं विद्वत्परितोषणेन कृतार्थीकर्तुमात्मानं समी-हन्ते दासः ॥

### A REQUEST.

Annual supplements will be issued about new books discovered, printed and noticed in Journals. Readers are requested to send such information to the author, and to suggest additions and amendments.

## INTRODUCTION

ॐ

अमिसीळे पुरोहितं यज्ञस्य देवमुत्तिष्ठं होतारं रत्नधातमम् ।

अग्निः पूर्वमिन्द्रविमिरिब्धो नूतनैर्यत सदेवो एह वक्षति ॥

1. **The sacred literature of India**, inferior to none in variety or extent, is superior to many in nobility of thought, in sanctity of spirit and in generality of comprehension. In beauty or prolixity, it can vie with any other literature ancient and modern. Despite the various impediments to the steady development of the language, despite the successive disturbances, internal and external, which India had to encounter ever since the dawn of history, she has successfully held up to the world her archaic literary map, which meagre outline itself favourably compares with the literature of any other nation of the globe. The beginnings of her civilization are yet in obscurity. Relatively to any other language of the ancient world, the antiquity of Sanskrit has an unquestioned priority. "Yet such is the marvellous continuity" says Max Muller "between the past and the present of India, that in spite of repeated social convulsions, religious reforms and foreign invasions, sanskrit may be said to be still the only language that is spoken over the whole extent of the vast country." So says M. Winternitz: "Sanskrit is not a 'dead' language even to day. There are still at the present day a number of Sanskrit periodicals in India, and topics of the day are discussed in Sanskrit pamphlets. Also, the Mahabharata is still today read aloud publicly, To this very day poetry is still composed and works written in Sanskrit, and it is the language in which Indian scholars converse upon scientific questions. Sanskrit at the least plays the same part in India still, as Latin in the Middle Ages in Europe, or as Hebrew with the Jews."<sup>1</sup>

"No country except India and no language except the Sanskrit can boast of a possession so ancient or venerable. No nation except the Hindus can stand before the world with such a sacred heirloom in its possession, unapproachable in grandeur and infinitely above all in

---

1. *India*, 78-9.

2. *History of Indian Literature*, I. 45.

glory. The Vedas stand alone in their solitary splendour, serving as a beacon of divine light for the onward march of humanity.”<sup>1</sup>

The sciences of Comparative Pathology and Mythology owe their origin to what has been termed the “Discovery of Sanskrit.” “To the Sanskrit, the antiquity and extent of its literary documents, the transparency of its grammatical structure, the comparatively primitive state of ancient system and thorough grammatical treatment it has early received at the hands of native scholars, must ever secure the foremost place in the comparative study of Indo-Aryan researches.”

2. A WEBER in his *Indian Literature* thus summed up his reasons for asserting the antiquity of the Vedic Literature :

In the more ancient parts of the *Rigveda-Samhita*, we find the Indian race settled on the north-western borders of India, in the Punjab, and even beyond the Panjab, on the Kubha, or *Kupna*, in Kabul. The gradual spread of the race from these seats towards the east, beyond the Sarasvati and over Hindustan as far as the Ganges, can be traced in the later portions of the Vedic writings almost step by step. The writings of the following period, that of the epic, consist of accounts of the internal conflicts among the conquerors of Hindustan themselves, as, for instance, the *Mahabharata*; or of the further spread of Brahmanism towards the south, as, for instance, the *Ramayana*. If we connect with this the first fairly accurate information about India which we have from a Greek source, viz., from Megasthenes, it becomes clear that at the time of this writer the Brahmanising of Hindustan was already completed, while at the time of the *Periplus* (see Lassen, *I. AK.*, ii. 150, n. ; *I. St.*, ii. 192) the very southernmost point of the Dekhan had already become a seat of the worship of the wife of Siva. What a series of years, of centuries, must necessarily have elapsed before this boundless tract of country, inhabited by wild and vigorous tribes, could have been brought over to Brahmanism. And while the claims of the written records of Indian literature to a high antiquity—its beginnings may perhaps be traced back even to the time when the Indo-Aryans still dwelt together with the Persa-Aryans—are thus indisputably proved by external, geographical testimony, the internal evidence in the same direction, which may be gathered from their contents, is no less conclusive. In the songs of Rik, the robust spirit of the people gives expression to the feeling of its relation to nature, with a spontaneous freshness and simplicity; the powers of

---

1. *Hindu superiority*. 156.

nature are worshipped as superior beings; and their kindly aid besought within their several spheres. Beginning with this nature-worship, which everywhere recognises only the individual phenomena of nature, and these in the first instance superhuman, we trace in Indian literature the progress of the Hindu people through almost all the phases of religious development through which the human mind generally has passed. The individual phenomena of nature, which at first impress the imagination as being superhuman, are gradually classified within their different spheres; and a certain unity is discovered among them. Thus we arrive at a number of divine beings, each exercising supreme sway within its particular province, whose influence is in course of time further extended to the corresponding events of human life, while at the same time they are endowed with human attributes and organs. The number—already considerable—of these natural deities, these regents of the powers of nature, is further increased by the addition of abstractions, taken from ethical relations; and to these as to the other deities divine powers, personal existence and activity are ascribed. Into this multitude of divine figures, the spirit of inquiry seeks at a later stage to introduce order, by classifying and co-ordinating them according to their principal bearings. The principle followed in this distribution is, like the conception of the deities themselves, entirely borrowed from the contemplation of nature. We have the gods who act in the heavens, in the air, upon the earth; and of these the sun, the wind, and fire are recognized as the main representatives and rulers respectively. These three gradually obtain precedence over all the other gods, who are only looked upon as their creatures and servants. Strengthened by these classifications, speculation presses on and seeks to establish the relative position of these three deities, and to arrive at unity for the supreme Being. This is accomplished either speculatively, by actually assuming such a supreme and purely absolute Being, viz., “Brahman” (neut), to whom these three in their turn stand in the relation of creatures, of creatures, of servants only; or arbitrarily, according as one or other of the three is worshipped as the supreme god. The sun-god seems in the first instance to have been promoted to this honour? the Persa-Aryans at all events retained this standpoint, of course extending it still further; and in the older parts of the Brahmanas also—to which rather than to the Samhitas the Avesta is related in respect of age and contents—we find the sun-god here and there exalted far above the other deities (*prasaṁta devānam*). We also find ample traces of this in the forms of worship, which so often preserve relics of antiquity. Nay,

as "Brahman" (masc), he has in theory retained this position, down even to the latest times, although in a very colourless manner. His colleagues, the air and fire gods, in consequence of their much more direct and sensible influence, by degrees obtained complete possession of the supreme power, though constantly in conflict with each other. Their worship has passed through a long series of different phases, and it is evidently the same which Megasthenes found in Hindustan, and which at the time of the Periplus had penetrated, though in a form already very corrupt, as far as the southernmost point of the Dekhan."

### 3. The Gods created Devavāni :

देवी वाचमजनयन्त देवास्ता विश्वरूपाः पशवो वदन्ति ।

सा नो मंत्रेषमूर्जं दुहाना धेनुर्वाग्स्तानुपसृष्ट्वैतु ॥ Rg. VIII. 100-11.

इन्द्रावरुणा यद्विभ्यो मनीषां वाचो मर्त्यं धृतमदत्तमग्रे ।

यानि स्थानान्यसृजन्त धीरा यज्ञं तन्वानास्तपसाभ्यपश्यन् ॥ Rg. VIII. 59-6.

Pañjanali says in his Mahābhāṣya :

चत्वारि शृङ्गा त्रयो अस्य पादा द्वे क्षीर्ये सप्त हस्तासो अस्य ।

त्रिधा बद्धो वृषमो रोरवीति महो देवो मर्त्यो आविवेश ॥"

ऋग्वेद ४।५८।३

अत्र व्याकरणमहामोष्यभाषको गोनर्दीयो गौणिकातनयो नानादर्शननिष्णातो मगवान् पतञ्जलिः प्राह— "चत्वारि शृङ्गाणि चत्वारि पदजातानि नामाख्यातोपसर्गनिपाताम् । त्रयो अस्य पादाः । त्रयः कालाः भूतमभिव्यद्वर्तमानाः । द्वे क्षीर्ये । द्वौ शब्दात्मानौ, नित्यः कार्यम् । सप्त हस्तासो अस्य । सप्त विमक्तयः । त्रिधा बद्धः । त्रिषु स्थानेषु बद्धः । उरसि कण्ठे शिरसीति । वृषमो वर्षणद् रोरवीति शब्दं करोति । कुत एतत् । रीतिः शब्दकर्म । महो देवो मर्त्यो आविवेशेति । महान् देवः शब्दो मर्त्यो मरणधर्माणो मनुष्याः तानाविवेश । महता देवेन नः सान्यं यथा स्यादित्यर्थे व्याकरणम् ।" (इति महामोष्ये पस्पष्टायाम्) ।

Vidyāraṇya adopts Pañjanali's views in his Introduction to his commentary on Rg Veda and there in speaking of the importance of the study of Grammar, he says :

व्याकरणमपि प्रकृतिश्रुत्यापदेष्टेन पदस्वरूपतदर्थनिश्चयाद्योपयुज्यते । तत्तत्तद्व्याकरणमहामोष्ये । समानायते सन्तै पराभ्यव्याकृतावस्ते देवा इदमनुवाजिमां नो वाचं व्याकुर्वीति । सोऽजसीद्वरं इमे मया वैवैष वाचये च सह युज्यता इति तस्मादैववाचकः सह युज्यते । तामिमे मन्वन्तेऽकम्प्यं व्याकरोत् । तस्मादिदं व्याकृता वायुयते । ते सं ६ ४ ७ ३१ इति । अथिमीते पुरोहितमिलादेवाक् पूर्वैरिम् कल्के परापी सयुग्मादिभिनवदेकालिम ॥ अथ व्याकृता वृद्धिः प्रत्ययः पदं व्याकृतमित्यादिनिश्चयाकारिभं वृद्धिस्तासीत् । तदानीं देवैः



प्रापित इन्द्र एकस्मिन्नेव पात्रे वायोः स्वस्य च सौमरसग्रहणरूपेण वरेण तुष्टस्तामसं-  
वाचं मध्ये विच्छिद्य प्रकृतिप्रत्ययादिविभागं सर्वत्राकरोत् । तस्मादियं वागिदानीमपि पाणि-  
न्यादिमहर्षिसिर्व्याकृता सर्वैः पठ्यत इत्यर्थः ।

उतत्वः पञ्चन ददर्श वाचमुतत्वः शृण्वन्नशृणोत्येनां । उतोत्वस्मै तन्वं विसृजे जायेव पत्न्य  
उच्यती सुवासाः । ऋग्वे १० । ७१ । ४ । अपि सुत्वेकः पश्यन्नपि न पश्यति । अपि सुत्वेकः  
शृण्वन्नपि न शृणोत्येनां । अविद्वांसमाहार्य । तस्मै अन्यस्मै तन्वं विसृजे । तनुं विवृणुते ।  
जायेव पत्न्य उच्यती सुवासाः यथा जाया पत्ये कामयमाना सुवासाः स्वमात्मानं विवृणुते एवं  
वाग्वाग्विदे स्वमात्मानं विवृणुते । वाङ्मनो विवृणुयादित्यव्येयं व्याकरणम् । सक्तुमिव तितउना  
पुञ्जतो यत् धीरा मनसा वाचमकत । अत्रासखायः सख्यानि जानते मद्रैषां लक्ष्मीर्निहिताधिवाचि ।  
ऋग्वे १० । ७१ । २ । सक्तुः सचतेर्दुर्घा वो भवति । कसतेर्वास्याद्विपरीतस्य विक्रसितो भवति ।  
तितउ परिपवनं भवति ततवद्वा तुलवद्वा । धीरा ध्यानवतो मनसा प्रज्ञानेन वाचमकत ।  
वाचमकृषत । अत्रा सखायः सख्यानि जानते । अत्र सखायः सख्यानि संजानते सायुव्यानि  
जानते । क एष दुर्गो मार्ग एकगम्यः । वाग्निषयः । के पुनस्ते । वैयाकरणाः । कुत एतत् ।  
मद्रैषां लक्ष्मीर्निहिताधिवाचि । एषां वाचि मद्रालक्ष्मीर्निहिता भवति । लक्ष्मीर्लक्षणाद्वासनात्परि-  
वृद्धाभवति । सारस्वती । याज्ञिकाः पठति । आहिताभिरपशब्दं प्रयुजानः प्राबञ्चितीया  
सारस्वतीसिद्धिं निर्वपेदिति । प्रायश्चित्तीया मा भूमेत्यन्येयं व्याकरणम् ।

Dvijendranath Guha collects some other references :

तत्रैव मगवान् यास्कः—“ चत्वारि शृङ्गेति वेदा वा एत उक्ताः । तयो अस्य पादा  
इति सन्नानि त्रीणि । द्वे शीर्षे प्रायणीयोदयनीये । सप्त हस्तासः सप्त ऊर्द्धासि । त्रिधा  
बद्धस्तेषा बद्धो भन्त्रब्राह्मणकल्पैः । वृषमो रोरवीति रोरवणमस्य सवनक्रमेण क्रगिमर्यजुर्मिः  
सामभिर्यदेनमृग्भिः शंसन्ति यजुर्मिर्यजन्ति सामभिः स्तुवन्ति । महो देव इत्येष हि महान् देवो  
यथज्ञो मर्त्यो अन्विषेतेत्येष हि मनुष्यानाविष्टति यजनाय” । (इति नैरुक्ते परिशिष्टे—  
१३।१।७) ।

यद्वा - -

चत्वारि वाक्परिमिता पदानि तानि विदुर्ब्राह्मणा ये मनीषिणः ।

यद्वा त्रीणि निहिता नेत्रयन्ति तुरीयं वाचो मनुष्या वदन्ति ॥

ऋग्वेदे १।१६४।४५, अथर्ववेदेऽपि ६।२५।२७।२६।१

अत्रापि च यास्काचार्यपादाः—“ चत्वारि वाचः परिमितानि पादानि तानि विदुर्ब्राह्मणा  
वे मेधाविनो गृहायां त्रीणि निहितानि नार्थं वेदयन्ते । यद्वा गृहतेस्तुरीयं त्वरतेः । कतमानि  
तानि चत्वारि पदान्योङ्कारो महाव्याहृतयश्चेत्कारम् । नामाख्याते चोपसर्गनिपाताश्चेति वैया-  
करणाः । भन्त्रः कल्पे ब्राह्मणं चतुर्धा व्यावहारिकीति याज्ञिकाः । ऋचो यजुषि सामानि  
चतुर्धा व्यावहारिकीति नैरुक्ताः । सर्पाणां धन्वयसां शुद्रस्य सरीसृपस्य चतुर्धा व्यावहारिकीति ।  
पञ्चपु त्वेषु भूमेष्वात्मनि चेत्मात्मप्रवादाः । अत्रापि ब्राह्मणं भवति, सा वै वाक् सृष्टा चतुर्धा

व्यमवदेव्येव लोकेषु त्रीणि पशुषु तुरीयम् । या पृथिव्यां साऽन्नौ, सा रथन्तरे यान्तरिक्षे, सा वायौ सा वामदेव्ये । या दिवि सादित्ये, या बृहति सा स्तनयित्नौ । अथ पशुषु ततो या नागत्वरिप्यत तां ब्राह्मणेप्वदधुस्तस्माद् ब्राह्मणा उभर्यां वाचं वदन्ति या च देवानां या च मनुष्याणामिति ।” (इति नैरुक्ते परिशिष्टे—१३।१।६) । अथैषाक्षरस्य स्तुतिः तावत् ऋग्वेदे १।१६४।३६, अथर्ववेदे ६।२८।८, तैत्तिरीय आरण्यके १०।१३, पुनः ऋग्वेदे १०।७१।८, नैरुक्ते परिशिष्टे च १३।१।१०-१३ वर्तते । (अत्रत्यदुर्गाचार्यव्याख्यानमपि द्रष्टव्यम् ।)

भूयश्च नैरुक्ते उपोद्धातप्रकरणे पदचतुष्टयोद्देशे उक्तम्—“तथान्येतानि चत्वारि पदजातानि नामाख्याते चोपसर्गनिपाताश्च तानीमानि मवन्ति” । अनन्तरं सप्तचत्वारि-शदक्षराण्युदभूतानीति श्रूयते । यथा—“सर्वे खरा इन्द्रस्यात्मानः । सर्वे उष्माणः प्रजापते-रात्मानः । सर्वे स्पर्शा मृलोरात्मानः ।” (सामवेदीयछान्दोग्योपनिषद्, २।२२।३) । अत्र खराणाम् इन्द्रः एव कर्त्ता (अर्थात् सर्वे अकारादयश्चतुर्दश खरा देवराजेन इन्द्रेण उद्भाविताः) । क्षषसहाः—प्रजापतिना चन्द्रेण च । कादयो मपर्यन्तानि समुदयाक्षराणि महादेवेन च वर्णितानि (ककारादयः स्पर्शवर्णा यरलवाश्च) । अत्रैव शाङ्करमाध्यम्—“सर्वे खरा अकारादयः इन्द्रस्य बलकर्मणः प्राणस्याऽऽमानो देहावयवस्थानीयाः । सर्वे उष्माणः क्षषसहादयः प्रजापतेर्विराजः कश्यपस्यैवाऽऽमानः । सर्वे स्पर्शाः कादयो व्यञ्जनानि मृलोरात्मानः ।

\* \* \* \* \*

इन्द्रादयो वेदे देवताः प्रख्याताः । तेषाम् आवासात् (त्रिदशालयात् देवनगराद्वा) सप्तचत्वारिंशदक्षराण्याविर्भूतानि । तन्निमित्तमेव “देवनागरः कृष्णः” इति कथ्यते, तदन्वित-माणा “देवभाषा” इति व्यपदिश्यते । तथाहि—“एते वै देवाः प्रत्यक्षं यद् ब्राह्मणाः ।” ऋक्संहितायामपि नेम ऋषिः (८।१००।११)—“देवी वाचमजनयन्त देवास्तां विश्वरूपाः पञ्चषो वदन्ति ।”

अत्र सायणमाध्यम्—“एषा माध्यमिका वाक् सर्वप्राण्यन्तर्गता धर्माभिवादिनी भवतीति विभूतिमुपदर्शयति यां देवीं धोतमानां माध्यमिकां वाचं देवा माध्यमिका अजनयन्त जनयन्ति तां वाचं विश्वरूपाः सर्वरूपाः व्यक्तवाचः अव्यक्तवाचश्च पञ्चषो वदन्ति तत्पूर्वकत्वात् वाक्यप्रवृत्तेः” \* \* \* \*

दीर्घतमा औचध्यः पुनरेव—“मन्त्रयन्ते दिवो अमुष्य गृष्टे विश्वविदं वाचमविश्व-भिन्वाम्” (ऋग्वेद १।१६४।१०) । सायणमाध्यम् तत्रैव—

“\* \* \* \* \*

दिवः गृष्टे शुलोकसोपरि अन्तरिक्षे मन्त्रयन्ते गुप्तं परस्परं भाषन्ते देवाः किं विश्वविदं विश्वेदेवन्समस्पर्शा विश्वैर्वेदनीया वा अविश्वभिन्वाम् अ सर्वव्यापिनी वाचं गार्जितलक्षणाम्

अमुष्य आदित्यस्य संबन्धिनो मन्त्रयन्ते इत्यर्थः ।” तस्मिन् काले भाषा अव्याकृता अमृत् । यथा—“ वाग् वै पराची अव्याकृता अत्रदत् ।” देवसृष्टा भाषा “देवभाषा” सर्वजनमान्या सर्वविदिता च । ततश्च, चतुर्मुखस्य आदेशात् इन्द्र-चन्द्र-महेशः “व्याकरणं” नाम शब्दशास्त्रं विरचयाम्बभूवुः ।

तत्रमाहेश व्याकरणविषये किंवदन्तीः—

“यान्युज्जहार माहेशाद् व्यासो व्याकरणार्णवात् ।

किन्तानि पदरत्नानि सन्ति पाणिनिगोपदे ।” इति ।

पक्षान्तरे यमस्य शब्दशास्त्रं न विद्यते इत्येव प्रसिद्धिः । तथाहि पाणिनीयशिक्षामन्त्रे, (३)—“त्रिषष्टिश्चतुःषष्टिर्वा वर्णाः शम्भुमते स्थिताः” अत एव अत्र जगति छेतायुगस्य इन्द्र-चन्द्र-मृतेशः आदितोऽक्षरोत्पादनकर्तार एवेति सम्यग् बोध्यम् ॥

4. **Sanskṛta**, or as now written, Sanskrit, is the language of the Gods, *Gīrvāṇavāṇī*. In this language stand the ancient scriptures of Vedic and Purāṇic religion. The Vedic literature is the most ancient record of any people of the world and forms the source of the earliest history of the Indo-Aryan race, nay, mankind as a whole.

“The Veda has two-fold interest : it belongs to the history of the world and to the history of India. In the history of the world the Veda fills a gap which no literary work in any other languages could fill. It carries us back to times of which we have no records anywhere, and gives us the very words of a generation of men, of whom otherwise we could form but the vaguest estimate by means of conjectures and inferences. As long as man continues to take an interest in the history of his race, and as long as we collect in libraries and museums the relics of former ages, the first place in that long row of books which contains the records of the Aryan branch of mankind, will belong for ever to the *Rig-veda*. The world of the Veda is a world by itself ; and its relation to all the rest of Sanskrit literature is such, that the Veda ought not to receive, but to throw light over the whole historical development of the Indian mind.”

The literature of the Vedas is termed Śruti, meaning what has been heard, that is, what is not the work of man.

5. Vedas are eternal (*nitya*), beginningless (*anādi*) and not made by man (*apauruṣeya*) ; (2) they were destroyed in the deluge at the end of the last *Kalpa*, and (3) that at the beginning of the present *Kalpa*

commencing with the *Kṛta-yuga* of this present Mahāyuga, the Rishis,<sup>1</sup> through *ṣaṣas*, re-produced in substance if not in form the ante-diluvian Vēdas which they carried in their memory by the favour of God. This is another expression of the historical view of modern scholars, like Mr. Tilak. They state that the Vedic or Āryan religion can be proved to be interglacial, but its ultimate origin is still lost in geological antiquity, that the Āryan religion and culture were destroyed during the last glacial period that invaded the Arctic Āryan home, and that the Vedic hymns were sung in post-glacial times by poets, who had inherited the knowledge or contents therein of an unbroken tradition from their ante-diluvian fore-fathers.

On the commencement of Vedic era, opinions are at the opposite poles. Tradition takes it to a remote age of millions of years on the computation of yugas.

In his *Arctic Home in the Vedas*, B. G. Tilak divides the whole period from the commencement of the Postglacial era, corresponding to the beginning of our Kṛta Yuga of the present Mahayuga to the birth of Buddha in five parts :—

"I. 10,000-8,000 B.C.—The destruction of the original Arctic home by the last Ice Age and the commencement of the post-glacial period.

II. 8,000-5,000 B.C.—The age of the migration from the original home. The survivors of the Aryan race roamed over the northern parts of Europe and Asia in search of lands suitable for new settlements. The Vernal Equinox was then in the constellation of Punarvasu, and as the Aditi is the presiding deity of Punarvasu, according to the terminology adopted by me in Orion, this may therefore, be called the Aditi or the Pre-Orion Period.

III. 5,000-3,000 B. C.—The Orion Period, when the Vernal Equinox was in Orion. Many Vedic Hymns can be traced to the

---

1. Brhadḍevaṇa enumerates woman-seers of the hymns.

गोषा घोषा विश्वपारा पालेषाम्नातृकर्षिका ।

ब्रह्मजाया जुह्वनाम अगस्त्यस्य स्वसा दितिः ।

इन्द्राग्नी चेन्द्रमाता च रारमा रोमशोर्वशी ।

लोपमुद्रा च नचम्र यमी नारी च शान्वती ।

शीर्लाक्षा सार्यराक्षी वाक् श्रद्धा मेधा च दक्षिणा ।

रात्री सूर्या च सावित्री ब्रह्मवादिन्य ईरिताः ॥

early part of this period and the bards of the race seem to have not yet forgotten the real import or significance of the traditions of the Arctic Home inherited by them. It was at this time that the first attempts to reform the calendar and the sacrificial system appear to have been systematically made.

IV. 3,060-1,400 B.C.—The Kṛittikā Period, when the Vernal Equinox was in the Pleiades. The Aitareya Samhita and the Brahmanas, which begin the series of Nakshatras with the Kṛittikas are evidently the productions of this period. The compilation of the hymns into Samhitas also appears to be a work of the early part of this period. The traditions about the Original Arctic home had grown dim by this time and very often misunderstood, making the Vedic hymns more unintelligible. The sacrificial system and the numerous details thereof found in the Brahmanas seem to have been developed during this time. It was at the end of this period that the Vedaṅga Jyōtisha was originally composed or at any rate the position of the equinoxes mentioned therein observed and ascertained.

V. 1,400-500 B.C.—The Pre-Buddhistic Period, when the Sūtras and the Philosophical system made their appearance."

6. "The atmosphere of England and Germany seems decidedly unpropitious to the recognition of this great Indian antiquity so stubbornly opposed to the Mosaic revelation and its Chronology dearly and piously cherished by these Western Orientalists. Strongly permeated with the Chronology of the Bible which places the creation of the Earth itself about 4,004 B.C., European scholars cannot place the great separation of the Original Aryan races themselves earlier than 2,000 B.C., and the first historical entry of the Hindu Aryas into the continent of India before 1,500 B.C." Arthur A. Macdonell, may be said to summarise the opinions of these Western Orientalists, when he says:—

"History is the one weak spot in Indian literature. It is, in fact, non-existent. The total lack of the historical sense is so characteristic, that the whole course of Sanskrit literature is darkened by the shadow of this defect, suffering as it does from the entire absence of exact chronology... Two causes seem to have combined to bring about this remarkable result. In the first place, early India wrote no *history*, because it never made any. The ancient Indians never went through a struggle for life, like Greeks in the Persian and the Romans in the Punic wars, such as would have welded their tribes into a nation, and developed political greatness. Secondly, the Brāhmanas, whose task it

would naturally have been to record great deeds, had early embraced the doctrine that all action and existence are a positive evil, and could therefore have felt but little inclination to chronicle historical events. Such being the case, definite dates do not begin to appear in Indian literary history till about 500 A.D. The chronology of the Vedic period is altogether conjectural, being based entirely on internal evidence. Three main literary strata can be clearly distinguished in it by differences in language and style, as well as in religious and social views. For the development of each of these strata a reasonable length of time must be allowed; but all we can here hope to do is to approximate to the truth by centuries. The lower limit of the second Vedic stratum cannot however be fixed later than 500 B.C., because its latest doctrines are presupposed by Buddhism, and the date of the death of Buddha has been with a high degree of probability calculated, from the recorded dates of the various Buddhist councils, to be 480 B.C. With regard to the commencement of the Vedic Age, there seems to have been a decided tendency amongst Sanskrit scholars to place it too high. 2,000 B.C. is commonly represented as its starting point. Supposing this to be correct, the truly vast period of 1,500 years is required to account for a development of language and thought hardly greater than that between Homeric and the Attic age of Greece. Professor Max Muller's earlier estimate of 1,200 B.C., forty years ago, appears to be much nearer the mark. A lapse of three centuries, say from 1,300-1,000 B.C., would amply account for the difference between what is oldest and newest in Vedic hymn poetry. Considering that the affinity of the oldest form of the Avestan language with the dialect of the Vedas is already so great that, by mere application of phonetic laws, whole Avestan stanzas may be translated word for word into Vedic, so as to produce verses correct not only in form but in poetic spirit; considering further, that if we know the Avestan language, at as early a stage as we know the Vedic, the former would necessarily be almost identical with the latter, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the Indian branch must have separated from the Iranian only a very short time before the beginnings of Vedic literature, and can therefore have hardly entered the North-West of India even as early as early as 1,500 B.C. All previous estimates of the antiquity of the Vedic period have been outdone by the recent theory of Professor Jacobi of Bonn, who supposes that period goes back to at least 4,000 B.C. This theory is based on astronomical calculations connected with a change in the beginning of the seasons, which Professor Jacobi thinks has

taken place since the time of the *Rigveda*. The whole estimate is, however, invalidated by the assumption of a doubtful, and even improbable, meaning in a Vedic word, which forms the very starting point of the theory."

7. "The history of the Sanskrit literature divides itself into two great ages, Vaidika and Laukika—Sacred and Profane,—Scriptural and Classical. The Mahabharata War is the dividing line between the two. The Vedic Age may again be divided into several distinct periods, each of which for length of years may well compare with that of the entire history of many an ancient nation, 1. Chandas Period. 2. Samhitā Period. 3. Brahmana Period, 4. Āraṇyaka Period and 5. Upaniṣad Period. Each of these periods has a distinct literature of its own, vast in its extent, and varied in its civilisation, each giving rise to the subsequent period under the operation of great social, political and religious causes; and the philosophical historian of human civilisation need not be a Hindu to think that the Ancient Āryas of India, have preserved the fullest, the clearest and the truest materials for his work."

8. "There are four Vedas, Rik (ऋक्), Yajur (यजुस्), Sāma (साम) and Atharvana (अथर्वण) and each Veda has Samhitā (mantra) Brāhmaṇa, Sūtra and Upaniṣad. The first three Vedas are called together as *Trayi* and they are called in Brahmanas also by the name *ṛcas*, Samant and Yajūmṣi, or Bhahvṛcas, Chandogas and Adhvaryus, The Sutras apply the term *chandas* to the Samhitas. Pāṇini uses the terms *chandas* and *Bhāṣa* to distinguish Vedic and non-Vedic literature. Yajur-veda has two Samhitas called Śukla and Kṛṣṇa; or Vajasaneya and Taittirīya."

"The Samhita of the Rik is purely a lyrical collection, forming the immediate source of the other three. The next two are made up of verses and ritual formulæ, meant to be recited at sacrifices. The Atharva Samhita resembles the Rik in that it forms a store of songs, devoted to sacrifices mostly in connection with incantations and magical charms."

9. The Brahmanic period comprehends "the first establishment of the three-fold ceremonial, the composition of the individual Brahmanas and the formation of the Charanas. They connect the sacrificial songs and formulas with the sacrificial rite by pointing out on the one hand their direct relation, and on the other their symbolical connection with each other. Their general nature is marked by masterly grandiloquence, and antiquarian sincerity. Though in the words of Prof.

Eggeling, these works deserve to be studied as a physician studies the twaddle of idiots or the raving of mad men, they lack not striking thoughts, bold expression and logical reasoning. The Brahmanas of the Rik generally refer to the duties of the Hotr; of the Saman, to those of Udgatr; of the Yajus, to the actual performance of the sacrifice. They are valuable to us as the earliest records of Sanskrit prose."

10. "The Sūtra literature forms a connecting link between the Vedic and the classical Sanskrit. 'Sutra' means a 'string' and compatibly with this sense, all works of this style are nothing but one uninterrupted chain of short sentences linked together in a most concise form.

Sutras represented a scientific expression of the tradition and discussion recounted in Brāhmaṇas. They systematised the source of the rituals and so far as Kalpasūtras or Śrautasūtras go, they relate strictly to śruti or the Vedas. To these sūtras have been added Gṛhyasūtras or those that regulate domestic rites. They are partly based on śruti and partly on smṛtis (unrevealed literature). Sūtras have been the consequence of a national need for concise guide-books for ceremonial, and represented a 'codification of case-law' in the sphere of sacrifices and ceremonials.<sup>2</sup>

11 Upaniṣads<sup>3</sup> are expressions of philosophical concepts. They embody the beginnings and progress of esoteric ideas, which had to a large extent been mentioned in Āraṇyakas, writings supplementary to Brāhmaṇas.

12. A. WEGGER sums up the direct data attesting the posteriority of the Classical Period thus :—

(i) Its opening phases everywhere presuppose the Vedic period as entirely closed; its oldest portions are regularly based on the Vedic literature; the relations of life have now all arrived at a stage of development of which in the first period we can only trace the germs and the beginning.

The distinction between the periods is also by changes in language and subject-matter.

1. It might be seen that the usefulness of this species of composition was so much appreciated that in every branch of learning sutras came to be composed and indeed are said to be the most ancient form of the sciences.

2. The authority of compositions like Upaniṣads has come to be respected to such an extent that in later times, several of that name were brought into being very often sometimes in their tenor. We have '106 Upaniṣads' and if not more on various topics, for instance, Garbhopaniṣad on embryology and Mammathopaniṣad on erotics.



*First, as regards language :—*

1. The special characteristics in the second period are so significant, that it appropriately furnishes the name for the period, whereas the Vedic period receives its designation from the works composing it.

2. Among the various dialects of the different Indo-Aryan tribes, a greater unity had been established after their emigration into India, as the natural result of their intermingling in their new home. The grammatical study of the Vedas fixed the frame of the language so that the generally recognised *Bhasha* had arisen. The estrangement of the civic language from that of the mass accelerated by the assimilation of the aboriginal races resulted in the formation of the popular dialects, the *prakrits*—proceeding from the original *Bhasha* by the assimilation of consonants and by the curtailment or loss of termination.

3. The phonetic condition of Sanskrit remains almost exactly the same as that of the earliest Vedic. In the matter of grammatical forms, the language shows itself almost stationary. Hardly any new formations or inflexions make their appearance yet. The most notable of these grammatical changes were the disappearance of the subjunctive mood and the reduction of a dozen infinitives to a single one. In declension the change consisted chiefly in the dropping of a number of synonymous forms.

4. The vocabulary of the language has undergone the greatest modifications. It has been extended by derivation and composition according to recognised types. Numerous words though old seem to be new, because they happen by accident not to occur in the Vedic literature. Many new words have come in through continental borrowings from a lower stratum of language, while already existing words have undergone great changes of meaning.

*Secondly, as regards the subject-matter :—*

1. The Vedic literature handles its various subjects only in their details and almost solely in their relation to sacrifice, whereas the classical discusses them in their general relations.

2. In the former a simple and compact prose had gradually been developed, but in the latter this form is abandoned and a rhythmic one adopted in its stead, which was employed exclusively even for strictly scientific exposition.

\* That difference of metre should form a broad line of demarcation between the periods of literature is not at all without analogy in the literary history of other nations, particularly in other times. If once a

new form of metre begins to grow popular by the influence of a poet who succeeds in collecting a school of other poets around him, this new mode of utterance is very apt to supersede the other more ancient forms altogether. People become accustomed to the new rhythm sometimes to such a degree, that they lost entirely the taste for their old poetry on account of its obsolete measure. No poet, therefore, who writes for the people, would think of employing those old fashioned metres; and we find that early popular poems have had to be transfused into modern verse in order to make them generally readable once more.

Now it seems that the regular and continuous Anushtubh sloka is a metre unknown during the Vedic age, and every work written in it may at once be put down as post-Vedic. It is no valid objection that this epic sloka occurs also in Vedic hymns, that Anushtubh verses are frequently quoted in the Brahmanas, and that in some of the Sutas the Anushtubh-sloka occurs intermixed with Trishtubhs, and is used for the purpose of recapitulating what had been explained before in prose. For it is only the *uniform* employment of that metre which constitutes the characteristic mark of a new period of literature.<sup>1</sup>

13. "The languages of the world have been divided into three families, the Aryan or Indo-European, the Semitic and the Turanian. The first comprises the Indian branch, consisting of Sanskrit, Pali and the Prakrits, and the modern vernaculars of Northern India and Ceylon; the Iranic branch consisting of Zend, the sacred language of the Parsis, the Pehlevi and the other cognate dialects; the Hellenic or the Greek branch, comprising the languages of Ancient Greece and its modern representatives; the Italic branch, consisting of the Latin and cognate ancient languages of Italy and the dialects derived from Latin, the Italian, the French and the old Provencal, the Spanish, the Portuguese, and the Wallachian; the Keltic or the language of those Kelts or Gauls that so often figure in Roman History, and distinguished into two varieties, the Kymric, now spoken in Wales and in the Province of Brittany in France, and the Gaelic spoken in the Isle of Man, the Highlands of Scotland, and Ireland; the Lithuanian and Slavonic, comprising the languages of Lithuania, Russia, Bulgaria, and of the Slavonic races generally; and the Teutonic branch, consisting of the Scandinavian group, i. e., the languages of Sweden, Norway, Iceland, and Denmark, of the High German *i.e.* the old and the present language of Germany, and of the Low German, which comprised the old Anglo-

---

1. Muir's *Critical History*, III. c. i.

Saxon and the other languages spoken on the coasts of Germany, the modern representatives of which are the English, and the dialects spoken in Holland, Friesland, and the North of Germany. The second family comprises the Hebrew, the Arabic, the Chaldee, the Syriac, the Carthaginian, and the cognate and derived languages; and the third, the Turkish and the languages of the Mongolian tribes. To this last family the dialects spoken in Southern India are also to be inferred. The Zend approaches Sanskrit the most, but the affinities of this latter with Greek and Latin are also very striking, and such as to convince even a determined sceptic. Sanskrit has preserved a greater number of ancient forms than any of these languages, hence it is indispensable for purposes of comparative philology."

14. "India may justly claim to be the original home of scientific philology. In one of the most ancient Sanskrit books, the *Sambhita* of the Black *Yajurveda*, there are distinct indications of the dawn of linguistic study.<sup>1</sup> The *Brahmaṇsas* of the Vedas which rank next to the *Sambhitas*, and even the *Taittiriya Samhita* itself, the composition of which differs in no particular from its *Brahmana*, are all full of etymological explanations of words, though often they are fanciful.<sup>2</sup> One *Acharya* followed another, and they all carefully observed the facts of their language, and laid down the laws they could discover. They studied and compared the significations and forms of words, observed what was common to them, separated the constant element from that which was variable, noticed the several changes that words undergo in different circumstances, and by such a process of philological analysis completed a system of grammar and etymology. In the *Nirukta*, *Yaska*, whose exact date we do not know, but who must have flourished several centuries before Christ, lays down correct principles of the derivation of words.

1. वाग्वै पराच्यव्याकृतावदत्ते देवा इन्द्रमब्रुवन्निर्मा नो वाचं व्याकुर्विति सोऽब्रवीद्वरं वृणु मधं चैवैष वायवे च सह गृह्णाता इति तस्मादैन्द्रवायवः सह गृह्यते तामिन्द्रो मध्यतोऽवक्रम्य व्याकरोत्तस्मादियं व्याकृता वागुच्यते. Speech was once inarticulate and undistinguished (into its parts). Then the gods said to Indra, 'Distinguish our speech into parts.' He said, 'I will ask a gift of you, let Soma be poured into one cup for me and Vayu together.' Hence Soma is poured into one cup for Indra and Vayu together. Then Indra going into its midst distinguished it. Hence distinct speech is now spoken. *Tait. Smh.*, VI. 4, 7.

2. The *Ait. Brah.* gives the etymology of प्रेष (III. 9), of मानुष (III. 23), of जाया (VII. 13); the *Tait. Samh.*, of रुद्र (I. 5,1), of वृत्र (II. 4,12 and II. 5, 2) the *Tait. Brah.* of अश्व (I. 1,5), of नक्षत्र (II. 7,18), &c. &c.

The last of the grammarian Acharyas were Pāṇini, Katyaiana, and Patanjali. The Prakṛit dialects which sprang from Sanskrit were next made the subject of observation and analysis. The laws of phonetic change or decay in accordance with which Sanskrit words became Prakṛit were discovered and laid down. The Sanskrit and non-Sanskrit elements in those languages were distinguished from each other. This branch of philology also was worked up by a number of men, though the writings of one or two only have come down to us.

In this condition Sanskrit philology passed into the hands of Europeans. The discovery of Sanskrit and the Indian grammatical system at the close of the last century led to a total revolution in the philological ideas of Europeans. But several circumstances had about this time prepared Europe for independent thought in philology, and Sanskrit supplied the principles upon which it should be conducted, and determined the current in which it should run. The languages of Europe, ancient and modern, were compared with Sanskrit and with each other. This led to comparative philology and the classification of languages, and a comparison of the words and forms in the different languages led scholars into the secrets of the growth of human speech, and the science of language was added to the test of existing branches of knowledge."<sup>1</sup>

It has been said by eminent writers that at one time Sanskrit was the one language spoken all over the world. "Sanskrit is the mother of Greek, Latin and German languages and it has no other relation to them," that "Sanskrit is the original source of all the European languages of the present days," and that "in point of fact the Zind is derived from the Sanskrit."<sup>2</sup>

15. Tradition traces the beginnings of the Sanskrit language to the fourteen aphorisms or Māheśvara sūtras. They are अ इ उ ऋ ए औ onwards to ऌ ॡ. These sounds, vowel and consonant, emanated from the sound of Śiva's damaru (drum) at the time of his dance. To these letters and sounds is attached a mystic significance and Nandikeśvara has explained their import with all solemnity. As the Kārikas of Nandikeśvara are rare, they are printed here.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. R. G. Bhandarkar, *Lectures on Development of Language of Sanskrit*, Bombay.

2. *Hindu Superiority*, 172-3; A. Dubois' *Bible in India*; MaxMüller's *Science of Language*, I, 225-6 note; Dvijendranath Guha's, *Devabhasha*, JSSP, XVIII. 150.

3. They are printed with the commentary of Upamanyu, in the *Nirṇayasagara* Edn. of Mahabhasya, p. 192.

ॐ

श्रीकृष्णाय नमः ॥

1. नृनावसाने नटराजराजो ननाद ढङ्कां नवपंचवारं ।  
उद्धर्तुकामः सनकादिसिद्धानेतद्विमर्शे शिवसूत्रजालम् ॥
2. अत्र सर्वत्र सूत्रेषु अत्यवर्णचतुर्दशे ।  
धात्वर्थं समुपदिष्टं पाणिन्यादीष्टसिद्धये ॥  
। अ इ उ ण् ।
3. अकारो ब्रह्मरूपः स्याद्विद्युः सर्ववस्तुषु ।  
चित्कलामि समाश्रित्य जगद्रूप उणेश्वरः ॥
4. अकारस्सर्ववर्णाग्रवः प्रकाशः परमेश्वरः ।  
आद्यसंत्येन संयोगादहमित्येव जायते ॥
5. सर्वं परात्मकं पूर्वं इतिमात्रमिदं जगत् ।  
शब्देर्बभूव पश्यंती मध्यमा वाक् ततः स्मृता ॥
6. वक्त्रे विशुद्धचक्राख्ये वैखरी सा मता ततः ।  
सृष्ट्याविर्भावमासाद्य मध्यमा वाक् समा मता ॥
7. अकारः सन्निधीकृत्य जगतां कारणत्वतः ।  
इकारः सर्ववर्णानां शक्तित्वात्कारणं गतम् ॥
8. जगत्स्रष्टुमभृदिच्छा यदाह्वासीत्तदभवत् ।  
कामबीजमिति प्राहुर्मुक्तयो वेदपाठगाः ॥
9. अकारो ह्यसिमात्रं स्यदिकारश्चित्कला मता ।  
उकारो विष्णुरित्याहुर्व्यापकत्वान्महेश्वरः ॥  
। क ल क् ।
10. कलक् सर्वेश्वरो मायां मनोवृत्तिमदर्शयत् ।  
तामेव वृत्तिमाश्रित्य जगद्रूपमजीजनत् ॥
11. वृत्तिवृत्तिमतोरधमेदवैशो न विद्यते ।  
चंद्रचंद्रिकयोः यद्वधथावागर्थयोरपि ॥
12. स्वेच्छया स्वस्य चिच्छतौ विश्वपुन्मीलयत्सौ ।  
वर्णानां मध्यमं कृत्वाभृत्त्वर्णद्वयं विदुः ॥  
। ए ओ ङ् ।
13. एओङ् मायेश्वरात्मैक्यविज्ञानं सर्ववस्तुषु ।  
साक्षित्वात्सर्वभूतानां स एक इति निश्चितम् ॥

। ऐ औ च् ।

14. ऐर्ओच् ब्रह्मस्वरूपः सन् जगत्स्वतर्गतं तत्ता .  
इच्छया विस्तरं कर्तुमाविरासिन्महामुनिः ॥

। ह य व र ढ् ।

15. भूतपंचकमेतरमाद्यवरणं महेश्वरात् ।  
व्योमवाय्वंबुवह्नयाख्यभूतान्यासीत् स एव हि ॥
16. हकारो व्योमसंज्ञं च यकारो वायुमुच्यते ।  
रकाराद्वह्निस्तोयं तु वकारादिति सैव वाक् ॥

। ल ण् ।

17. आधारभूतं भूतानामन्नादीनां च कारणम् ।  
अन्नाद्वैतस्ततो जीवकारणत्वाद्गुणिरितं ॥

। ज म ङ ण न म् ।

18. शब्दस्पर्शौ रूपरसगंधाश्च जमणनम् ।  
व्योमादीनां गुणा ह्येते जानीयात्सर्ववस्तुषु ॥

। क्ष भ ज् ।

19. वाक्पाणी च क्षमजासीद्वराद्रूपचिदात्मनः ।  
सर्वजंतुषु विज्ञेयं स्थावरादीं न विद्यते ।  
वर्गाणां तुर्यवर्णा ये कर्मेन्द्रियभ्या हि ते ॥

। घ ढ ध ष् ।

20. घढधष् सर्वभूतानां पादपायू उपस्थकः ।  
कर्मेन्द्रियगुणा ह्येते जाता हि परमार्थतः ॥

। ज ब ग ङ द श् ।

21. श्रोत्रत्वंगून्यनघ्राणिजङ्घार्घ्येन्द्रियपंचकं ।  
सर्वेषामपि जंतूनामीरितं जबगङ्गदश् ॥

। ख फ छ ठ थ च ट त व् ।

22. प्राणादिपंचकं चैव मनोबुद्धिरहंकृतिः ।  
बभूव कारणत्वेन खफछठथ चटतव् ॥

23. वर्गद्वितीयवर्णोत्थः प्राणाद्याः पंचवायवः ।  
मध्यवर्गस्तयाज्जाता-अंतःकरणवृत्तयः ॥

| क प य् |

24. प्रकृतिं पुरुषं चैव सर्वेषामेव सम्मतम् ।  
संभूतमिति विज्ञेयं कपयुस्यादिति निश्चितम् ॥

| श ष स र् |

25. स.चं रजस्तम इति गुणानां त्रितयं पुरा ।  
समाश्रित्य महादेवः शषसर् क्रीडति प्रभुः ॥

26. शकाराद्राजसोद्भूतिः षकारात्तामसोद्भवः ।  
सकारात्सत्त्वसंभूतिरिति त्रिगुणसंभवः ॥

| ह ल् |

27. तत्वातीतः परः साक्षी सर्वानुग्रहविग्रहः ।  
अहमात्मापरो हल् स्यामिति शंभुस्तिरोदधे ॥

इति नंदिकेश्वरकृता काशिका समाप्ता ॥

16. " The literature of Sanskrit presents, as ordinarily considered, two varieties of the language ; but a third may also, as I shall presently endeavour to show, be clearly distinguished. Of these the most ancient is that found in the hymns of the *Rigveda Samhitā*. These were composed at different times and by different *Rishis*, and were transmitted from father to son in certain families. Thus the third of the ten collections, which make up the *Samhitā* bears the name of *Viśvāmitra*, and the hymns contained in it were composed by the great patriarch and his descendants. The seventh is ascribed to *Vasishṭha* and his family. The composition of these hymns therefore extended over a long period, the language is not the same throughout, and while sometimes they present a variety so close to the later Sanskrit that there is little difficulty in understanding them, the style of others is so antiquated that they defy all efforts at interpretation, and their sense was not understood even by the *Rishis* who flourished in the very next literary period, that of the *Brāhmaṇas*. Still for our purposes we may neglect these differences and consider the Vedic variety of Sanskrit as one."

17. The history of Sanskrit affords considerable scope for a study of the growth of language. It presents distinct varieties of speech which are linked together exactly as Modern English is with the Anglo-Saxon. The *most ancient form* is that composing the text of the *Rig Veda Samhitā*. Consisting of ten books, it was the work of different *rishis*, preserved by oral tradition in their families. Despite the minute distinctions in the language of the *Rik Samhitā*, we may for all practical purposes treat

the Vedic variety of Sanskrit as a compact dialect. Prominently, this dialect presents some peculiarities of form and usage, which may thus be summed up :

- (i) The nominative plural of noun ending in अ is असस् as well as अस् as देवासः or देवाः, the instrumental being देवभिः or देवैः,
- (ii) The nominative and the vocative dual and plural of nouns in अ not rarely end in आ as येनेमा विश्वा च्यवना कृतानि.
- (iii) The instrumental singular of feminine nouns in इ is occasionally formed by lengthening the vowel as धींती and सती.
- (iv) The locative singular termination is often elided as परमे व्योमद्.
- (v) The accusative of nouns in उ are formed by ordinary rules of euphonic combination as तन्वम् or तनुवम्; and the instrumental by affixing औ or या or इया as उविया or साधुया.
- (vi) The dative of the personal pronouns ends in ए as युष्मे or अस्मे.
- (vii) The parasmaipada first person plural termination is मसि as त्वमस्माकन्वस्मसि, and of the third person plural is रे or रते as दुह्रे or दुह्रते.
- (viii) The त् of the ātmanepada termination is often dropped as दक्षिणतश्शेय; and instead of ध्व there is ध्वात्, as वारयध्वात्.
- (ix) In the place of the imperative second person plural, there are त, तन्, थन and तात् as शृणोत, पचतन, यतिष्ठन and कृणुतात्.
- (x) Eight different forms of the mood लोट्, signifying condition, are everywhere abundant as प्रण आयूंषि तारिषत्.
- (xi) Roots are not restricted to particular conjugations and at the caprice of the Rishi the same comes to more than one class.
- (xii) The infinitive suffixes are से, ध्ये, अर्ध्यै, तवे and तवै as वक्षे, असे, पृणय्यै, सतवे and मादयत्तवै; the accusatives of some nouns are treated as infinitives governed by शक्, as विभागं नाशकत्; the terminations तोस् and कस् occur when combined with ईश्वर as विचरितोः or विलिखः; the potential participles are



denoted by the suffixes तत्रै, ऐ, एण्य and त्व as स्लेच्छितवै, अवगाहे, दिदक्षेण्य and कर्त्तव्यम्; the 'indeclinable' past ends in त्वाय as गत्वाय; some forms as पतिव्री are also met with.

(xiii) A variety of verbal derivatives as दर्शत (handsome), जीवस् (Life) and जनुस् (product) are frequent.

(xiv) A large number of words which have become obsolete or lost their significance in later Sanskrit are everywhere abundant as परिपन्थि, वनु and अमीवा.

These peculiarities have been noted as the most frequent and the most salient, but many others are mentioned by Pāṇini. The Vedic dialect is the first record of the Sanskrit tongue, from which by processes of phonetic decay and natural elision the later language has been perfected.

Here is a specimen of Vedic Sanskrit :—

१. यच्चिद्धि ते विशो यथा प्र देव वरुण व्रतम् । मिनीमसि यविद्यन्नि ॥
२. मा नो वधाय हतनवे जिहीष्मन्स्य रीरधः । मा हृणानस्य मन्यवे ॥
५. कदा क्षत्रश्रियं नरमा वरुणं करामहे । मृळीकायोरुचक्षसंम् ॥
७. वेदा यो वीनां पदमन्तरिक्षेण पतताम् । वेद नावः समुद्रियः ॥
१०. नि षसाद धृतव्रतो वरुणः पस्त्रास्त्रा । साम्राज्याय सुक्रतुः ॥
११. अतो विश्वान्यद्भुता चिकित्वाँ अमि पश्यति । कृतानि या च कर्त्तव्या ॥
१२. स नो विश्वाहा सुक्रतुरादित्यः सुपथा करत् । प्र ण आयूषि तारिषत् ॥
१९. इमं मे वरुण धुधी हवमथा च मृळय । त्वामवस्युरा चक्रे ॥

"These eight verses contain 72 different *padas* or grammatical forms, not counting the prepositions as separate *padas*. Of these, 19 have become altogether obsolete in classical Sanskrit, and 12 have changed their significations."

18. The Brahmanas of the R̥k and the Yajus present the *second stage* in the development. Many of the peculiar words have become obsolete, and the declensions have mostly approached the classical grammar. The roots have no indiscriminate conjugation. The subjunctive is almost gone out of use. The indeclinable past and the gerundial infinitive end in त्वा and तुम्; verbal forms of all moods and tenses are seen in abundance. Still there are the touches of the vedic relationship and archaisms are not rare :—

- (i) Some feminine nouns have common forms for the dative and the genitive, as पृथिव्यै राजास्याः ;

- (ii) The न of the third person is often dropped as before, as  
सर्वतौ वी प्रसवानामा ;
- (iii) Some of the aorist forms do not follow the rules of Pāṇini,  
as अङ्गते वा अस्य दन्ता ;
- (iv) Some antiquated words occur as अर्नाक (a shaft) निद्राव (referee)  
भगवास् (prosperous).

The Aitareya Brāhmaṇa quotes some *gāthas* which are obviously more archaic than the rest of the work. Notwithstanding these irregularities, the Brāhmaṇas are "the best representatives extant of the verbal portion of that language of which Panini writes the grammar, though he did not mean these when he spoke of the *bhāṣa*." The gradual and perhaps rapid progress in the symmetry and simplicity of the language had still to be accelerated by the work of later authors and their writings furnish an ample illustration of the next stage of linguistic development.

19. YASKA'S NIRUKTA forms the intermediate link between the Vedic and the non-Vedic literature. It is not devoid of archaic expression, for we meet with such phrases as 'उपदेशाय रक्षयन्तः' (unable to teach) and 'शिशिष्य राज्येन' (invested with sovereignty). But we have no clue to the dawn of a change of style from simplicity to complexity. To the same period in the history of Sanskrit belongs PANINI. His *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is based on the grammar of the *bhāṣa*. No language has survived to us that literally represents Pāṇini's standard of dialect. Perhaps the later Brāhmaṇas are the only best representatives. At any rate there is no portion of the existing Sanskrit literature that accurately represents Pāṇini's Sanskrit, as regards the verbs and the nominal derivatives. Probably his grammar had for its basis the vernacular language of his day. Yaska and Pāṇini stand to us the authorities on record of that form of the language which immediately followed the purely Vedic stage.

20. Times had advanced, and with it the language. Pāṇini's *bhāṣa* could no longer stand stationary. The operation of the concurrent causes of linguistic progress had by the days of KATYAYANA and PATANJALI modified Pāṇini's denotation and introduced new changes in the grammar of the language or in the scope of the aphorisms. Kātyāyana's *Vārtikas* and Patanjali's *Mahābhāṣya* are devoted to the proper interpretation of the sūtras and to the apt introduction of the missing links. If to Kātyāyana's eyes 10,000 inaccuracies are discernible in Pāṇini, the only explanation must be that to Pāṇini they were not

inaccuracies, but by Kāṭyāyana's time the language had progressed and necessitated a fresh appendix or erratum in Pāṇini's grammatical treatise. The period of intervention must have been sufficiently long to allow old grammatical forms to become obsolete and even incorrect and words and their meanings to become antiquated and even ununderstandable.

21. Patañjali discusses the change and progress of the language, in the sāstric form of a dialogue between an objector and a mover thus:

अस्त्यप्रयुक्तः

संति वै शब्दा अप्रयुक्ताः तद्यथा-- ऊप, तेर, नक्र, भिचति ।

किमतो यस्त्यप्रयुक्ताः ?

प्रयोगाद्भि भवान् शब्दानां साधुत्वमवश्यस्यति य इदानीमप्रयुक्ता नास्मी साधवस्सुः ।

इदं तावत् विप्रतिषिद्धं--यदुच्यते-- संति वै शब्दा अप्रयुक्ताः इति, यदि सन्ति नाप्रयुक्ताः, अथाप्रयुक्ताः न संति, सति चाप्रयुक्ताश्चेति विप्रतिषिद्धं । प्रयुञ्जान एव खलु भवानाह सन्ति शब्दा अप्रयुक्ता इति कश्चेदानीमन्यो भवजातीयकः पुरुषः शब्दानां प्रयोगे साधुस्स्यार् ? नैतत् विप्रतिषिद्धम् । सन्तीति तावत् ब्रूमः यदेतान् शास्त्रविदः शास्त्रेणानुविदधते । अप्रयुक्ता इति ब्रूमः, यल्लोकेऽप्रयुक्ता इति । यदुच्यते--कश्चेदानीमन्यो भवजातीयकः पुरुषः शब्दानां प्रयोगे साधुः स्यादिति । न ब्रूमोऽस्माभिरप्रयुक्ता इति ।

किं तर्हि ?

लोकेऽप्रयुक्ता इति ।

ननु च खल्वन्यत्रो लोके ।

अभ्यन्तरोऽहं लोके, नत्वहं लोकः ।

अस्त्यप्रयुक्त इति चेन्नार्थे शब्दप्रयोगात् ।

अस्त्यप्रयुक्त इति चेत् तत्र किं कारणम् ?

अर्थे शब्दप्रयोगात् । अर्थे शब्दाः प्रयुज्यन्ते ।

संति चेष्वां शब्दानामर्था येऽवर्थेषु प्रयुज्यन्ते ॥

अप्रयोगः प्रयोगान्यत्वात् ।

अप्रयोगः खल्वप्येषां शब्दानां न्यायः । कुतः ? प्रयोगान्यत्वात् । यदेवा शब्दानामर्थेऽन्यान् शब्दान् प्रयुज्यते । तद्यथा--उपेत्यस्य शब्दस्यार्थे, क यूयमुषिताः ; तेरेत्यस्यार्थे, क यूयं तीर्णाः ; चक्रेत्यस्यार्थे, क यूयं कृतवन्तः ; पेचेल्यस्यार्थे, क यूयं पक्तवन्त इति ।

अप्रयुक्ते दीर्घसत्रवत् ।

यद्यप्यप्रयुक्तः अवश्यं दीर्घसत्रवृद्धिर्णेतानुविधेयाः । तद्यथा दीर्घसत्राणि वार्षशतिकानि वार्षसहस्रकाणि च न चाद्यत्वे कश्चिदप्याहरति । केवलं ऋषिसंप्रदायो धर्म इति कृत्वा याज्ञिकाः शास्त्रेणानुविदधते ।

सर्वे देशान्तरे ।

सर्वे खल्वेते शब्दाः देशान्तरेऽपि प्रयुज्यन्ते ।

न चैवोपलभ्यन्ते ?

उपलब्धौ यत्नः क्रियतां ।

महान् शब्दस्य प्रयोगविषयः ।

सप्तद्वीपा वसुमती, त्रयो लोकाः, चत्वारो वेदाः सांगाः सरहस्याः बहुधा भिन्नाः, एक-  
शतम्भ्वर्युशाखाः, सहस्रवर्मा सामवेदः, एकविंशतिधा बाह्वृच्यं, नवधाऽधर्वणो वेदः, वाको-  
वाक्यमितिहासः पुराणं वैद्यकमित्येतावान् शब्दस्य प्रयोगविषयः । एतावन्तं शब्दस्य प्रयोग-  
विषयमननुनिश्चय सन्त्यप्रयुक्ता इति वचनं केवलं साहसमालम्बेव ।

एतस्मिंश्चातिमैहति शब्दस्य प्रयोगविषये एते शब्दाः तत्र तत्र नियतविषयाः दृश्यन्ते ।  
तद्यथा । श्वतिर्गतिर्कर्मा कर्मोजेष्वेव भाषितो भवति विकारः येनमार्या भाषन्ते श्व इति ।  
हम्मतिः सुराष्ट्रेषु रंहतिः प्राच्यमध्येषु गमिमेवत्वार्या प्रयजते । दातिलेवनार्थे प्राच्येषु,  
कात्तमुदीच्येषु ।

ये चाप्येते भवतोऽप्रयुक्ताः अभिमताः शब्दाः ये तेषामपि प्रयोगो दृश्यते । क ?  
बन्धे । तद्यथा “ सप्तास्यरेवतीरेवदूषा, यद्वो रेवती रेवत्यं तमूष, यन्मे नरः श्रुत्यं ब्रह्म चक्र,  
यत्रा नश्चक्रा ज्वरसं तनुनाम् ” इति ।<sup>1</sup>

PURV. अस्त्यप्रयुक्तः । There exist (some) words which are not used ;  
for instance, ऊष, तेर, चक्र, पेच. (These are forms of the second person  
plural of the Perfect.)

The *Siddhantin*, or the principal teacher, who advocates the  
doctrine that is finally laid down asks :—

SID. What if they are not used ?

PURV. You determine the grammatical correctness of words from  
their being used. Those then that are not now used are not gramma-  
tically correct.

SID. What you say is, in the first place, inconsistent, viz., that  
words exist which are not used. If they exist they cannot be not used ;  
if not used, they cannot exist. To say that they exist and are not used

1. *Mahābhāṣya*, (Nirṇayasāgara Edition), Vol I, pages 62-65.

is inconsistent. You yourself use them (utter them) and say (in the very breath) there are words which are not used. What other worthy like yourself would you have to use them in order that they might be considered correct? (lit. What other person-like yourself is correct or is an authority in the use of words).

PURV. This is not inconsistent. I say they exist, since those who know the Śāstra teach their formation by [laying down] rules, and I say they are not used, because they are not used by people. Now with regard to [your remark] "What other worthy, &c." [when I say they are not used] I do not mean that they are not used by me.

SID. What then?

PURV. Not used by people.

SID. Verily, you also are one amongst the people.

PURV. Yes, I am *one*, but am not *the people*.

SID. (Vart. अस्वप्रयुक्त इति चेन्नार्थे शब्दप्रयोगात्). If you object that they are not used, it will not do (the objection is not valid).

PURV. Why not?

SID. Because words are used to designate things. The things do exist which these words are used to designate. (Therefore the words must be used by somebody. If the things exist, the words that denote them must exist).

PURV. (Vart. अप्रयोगः प्रयोगान्यत्वात्). (It does not follow.) Their non-use is what one can reasonably infer.

SID. Why?

PURV. Because they (people) use other words to designate the things expressed by these words; for instance, क यूयमुषिताः in the sense of ऊष ; क यूयं तीर्णाः in the sense of तेर ; क यूयं कृतवन्तः in the sense of चक्र ; क यूयं पक्वन्तः in the sense of पेच. (We here see participles had come to be used for verbs of the Perfect Tense).

SID. (Vart. अप्रयुक्ते दीपिसत्रवत्). Even if these words are not used they should be essentially taught by rules just as long sacrificial sessions are. It is in this way. Long sacrificial sessions are such as last for a hundred years and for a thousand years. In modern times none whatever holds them, but the writers on sacrifices teach them by rules, simply because [to learn] what has been handed down by tradition from the Rishis is religiously meritorious. And moreover (Vart. सर्वे देशान्तरे), all these words are used in other places.

PURV.—They are not found used.

SID.—An endeavour should be made to find them. Wide indeed is the range over which words are used ; the earth with its seven continents, the three worlds, the four Vedas with their angas or dependent treatises and the mystic portions, in their various recensions, the one hundred branches of the Adhvaryu (Yajur-Veda), the Sama-Veda with its thousand modes, the Bahvichya with its twenty-one varieties, and the Atharvāṇa Veda with nine, Vakavakya, Epics, the Purāṇas, and Medicine. This is the extent over which words are used. Without searching this extent of the use of words, to say that words are not used is simple rashness. In this wide extent of the use of words, certain words appear restricted to certain senses in certain places. Thus, शवति is used in the sense of motion among the Kāmbojas ; the Aryas use it in the derived form of शव ; हस्मति is used among the Surasbāṭras रंहति among the eastern and central people, but the Aryas use only गम् ; दाति is used in the sense of 'cutting' among the easterns दात्र among the northerners. And those words which you think are not used are also seen used.

PURV.—Where ?

SID.—In the Veda. Thus, सप्तास्ये रेवती रेवदूय । यदो रेवती रेवत्यां तमूष ॥  
यन्मे नरः ध्रुवं ब्रह्म चक्रं । यत्रानश्नका जरसं तदूनाम् ।

[“ We here see that the objector says that certain words or forms are not used by people, and therefore they should not be taught or learnt. The instances that he gives are forms of the perfect to some roots and observes that the sense of these forms is expressed by using other words which are perfect participles of these roots. These statements are not denied by the Siddhanti, but he does not allow that the forms should not be taught on that account. Though not used, they should be taught and learnt for the sake of the religious merit consequent thereon, just as the ceremonial of long sacrificial sessions, which are never held, is. Then the objector is told that though not used by people, the words may be current in some other country, continent, or word, or they must have been used somewhere in the vast literature of the language. As regards the particular instances, two of them are shown to be used in the Vedas. It thus follows that in the time of Kātyāyana and Patanjali, such verbal forms had become obsolete, and participles were used in their place. But it must have been far otherwise in the time of Pāṇini. He gives minute rules for constructing the innumerable forms of the Sanskrit verb.”]

22. A few of those prominent changes are given below :—

- (i) Pāṇini in a special rule says that इतर has इतरम् for its neuter in the Vēdas. Obviously he intended to exhaust the list. Kāṭyāyana has to add एकतर to it.
- (ii) Pāṇini, when he says विट्किरः शकुनिर्विकिरो वा, would imply that each form has no other sense than that of a bird ; but Kāṭyāyana adds that both the forms are optional in the sense of 'birds,' while in any other sense they represent separate words ;
- (iii) The vocative singular of neuter nouns ending in अन् such as ब्रह्मन् is according to Pāṇini ब्रह्मन्, but Kāṭyāyana would add an optional ब्रह्म ;
- (iv) Some feminine formations are not noticed by Pāṇini, which Kāṭyāyana is forced to allow, as आर्याणी and उपाध्यायी.
- (v) The word आश्रय is rendered as अनिल by Pāṇini ; Kāṭyāyana substitutes for it अडुग
- (vi) The words and meanings of words employed by Kāṭyāyana are such as we meet with in the classical period and his expressions would not invite any special attention. This cannot be said of Pāṇini. Many of his words are antiquated in the later language as मति (*desire*), उपसंवाद (*bargain*), होत्र (*priest*).

“In Pāṇini's time a good many words and expressions were current which afterwards became obsolete ; verbal forms were commonly used which ceased to be used in Kāṭyāyana's time, and some grammatical forms were developed in the time of the latter which did not exist in Pāṇini's. Pāṇini's Sanskrit must, therefore, be identified with that which preceded the Epics, and he must be referred to the literary period between the Brahmanas and Yaska. Hence it is that the Brahmanas, as observed before, are the best existing representatives of the language of which Pāṇini writes the grammar. Kāṭyāyana on other hand wrote when the language arrived at that stage which we have called classical. Thus, then, we have been able to trace three distinct periods in the development of Sanskrit. First, we have the Vedic period, to which the R̥gveda Saṃhita, the Mantra portion of the Yajurveda, and the more antiquated part of the Atharva-Saṃhita are to be referred. Then commences another period, at the threshold of which we find the Brahmanas, which, so to say, look backwards to the preceding,

that is, present the vedic language in the last stage of its progress towards Paṇini's Bhasha; and, later on, we have Yaska and Paṇini. This may be called the period of Middle Sanskrit. And last of all, there is the classical period to which belong the Epics, earliest specimens of Kavyas and dramatic plays, the metrical Smṛitis, and the grammatical work of Katyayana. Paṇini's work contains the grammar of Middle Sanskrit, while Katyayana's that of classical Sanskrit, though he gives his sanction to the archaic forms on the principle, as he himself has stated, on which the authors of the sacrificial Sūtras teach the ritual of long sacrificial sessions, though they had ceased to be held in their time. Patanjali gives but few forms which differ from Katyayana's and in no way do they indicate a different stage in the growth of the language; hence his work is to be referred to the same period. The form which the language assumed at this time became the standard for later writers to follow, and Katyayana and Patanjali are now the generally acknowledged authorities on all points concerning the correctness of Sanskrit speech. We shall hereafter see that the last two stages have left distinct traces on the Prakṛits or the derived languages.

Professor Goldstucker has shown from an examination of the Vartikas, that certain grammatical forms are not noticed by Paṇini, but are taught by Katyayana and concludes that they did not exist in the language in Paṇini's time. I have followed up the argument in my lectures 'On the Sanskrit and Prakṛit languages,' and given from the Vartikas several ordinary instances of such forms. From these one of two conclusions only is possible, *viz.*, either that Paṇini was a very careless and ignorant grammarian, or that the forms did not exist in the language in his time. The first is of course inadmissible, wherefore the second must be accepted. I have also shown from a passage in the introduction to Patanjali's Mahabhashya, that verbal forms such as those of the Perfect which are taught by Paṇini as found in the Bhasha or current language, not the Cnhandasa or obsolete language, had gone out of use in the time of Katyayana and Patanjali, and participles had come to be used instead. Professor Goldstucker has also given a list of words used by Paṇini in his sūtras in a sense which became obsolete in the time of Katyayana and shown what portion of Sanskrit literature did not probably exist in Paṇini's time but was known to Katyayana, and in one case comes to the not unjustifiable conclusion that the time that had elapsed between Paṇini and Katyayana was so great that certain literary words which either did not exist in Paṇini's time or were not old to him came to be considered by Katyayana to be as old as



those which were old to Pāṇini. Again, according to Pāṇini's rules the Aorist expresses (1) past time generally, or the simple completion of an action, (2) the past time of this day and not previous to this day and (3) recent past time; and thus resembles in every respect the English Present Perfect. But in the later language the distinction between that tense and the other two past tenses is set aside and the Aorist is used exactly like these. Now, the language of the verses ascribed to Pāṇini and generally the language of what Professor Max Muller calls the Renaissance period is grammatically the same as that of Katyayana and Patanjali, and is the language of participles instead of verbs; and even from theirs it differs in making extensive use of compounds and neglecting the distinction between the Aorist and the other past tenses. The Sanskrit of Pāṇini's time is more archaic than that of Katyayana's time, and Pāṇini's rules are nowhere more scrupulously observed than in such an ancient work as the Aitareya Brahmana. The many forms and expressions which he teaches, and which must have existed in language are nowhere found in the later literature; while specimens of them are to be seen in that Brahmana and like works. Between therefore the archaic language of the sutras and the language which Pāṇini calls Bhasha and of which he teaches the grammar, on the one hand, and the language of the Renaissance period on the other is such a wide difference that no one will ever think of attributing a work written in the style and language of this period to the Great Grammarian. As Yaska and Pāṇini to the same period of Sanskrit literature the style and manner of a work written by Pāṇini the grammarian, must resemble those of the Nirukta; but in the few verses attributed to Pāṇini there is no such resemblance whatever. Should the entire work be discovered and found as a whole to be written in an archaic style, there will be time enough to consider its claim on behalf of these artificial verses.<sup>1</sup>

23. "The earliest Sanskrit Alphabet was possibly made up of five semi-vowels, five nasals, five soft and five hard aspirates, in all twenty consonants. The twenty sounds found in the aphors ह्यवरट्, रुण्, वमङ्गनम्, ह्रस्व, वदधर्, खमङ्गयव्, are the oldest, the final consonants being of course later additions. As no consonants can be pronounced without a vowel, the sound of *a*, *au* or *o*, according to the idiosyncrasies of the several tribes, came to be unconsciously blended with it. The aphors शपसर् and हर्ल् belong to a subsequent age, the four consonants in them being more or less connected in origin with *jh-z*. In course

---

1. R. G. Bhandarkar, *Date of Patanjali*.

of time the aspirates produced the unaspirates, and the aphors जवगाडदस् and कपप्, were added, the three consonants चटत being placed before व्. The order in which the vowels *a, i, u, e, o* are arranged is the same with that of the semi-vowels *h, y, r, l*, thus raising a suspicion that the correspondence between the 5 vowels and the 5 semi-vowels was not quite unknown in the age of the composition of the vowel-aphors. There is again a suspicion, that the vowels *e* and *o*, which have a separate aphor एओङ् assigned to them, were originally monophs, *not* diphthongs; the only diphthongs known in this age were *ai* and *au* formed of *a+i* and *a+u* respectively. These four aphors thus belong to an age, when 9 vowels in all, 7 monophs and 2 diphthongs, were recognised. Were the seven monophs pronounced short or long? their traditional pronunciation is no doubt short; but in an age not accustomed to the distinction between short and long, the pronunciation was possibly also long, at least among some of the tribes.

Did Pāṇini recognise the vowel *ṛ* in the aphor कलक्? or did the aphor in his age contain only क? The aphors लण् and हल्ल contain only one letter each, and it may be held, that like them the aphor कक् also contained only one letter, namely क. There is only one root, viz., कल्प्, containing the vowel *ṛ*. But Pāṇini does not recognise the root as कल्प्; according to him (कृपो-18, 2, VIII), the root is कृप् and कल्प् is formed from कृप् by changing the sound of *ṛ* in it to *ḷ*. Pāṇini, thus deriving कल्प् from कृप्, recognises *no* *ṛ* in the aphor कलक्, the grammatical tradition is therefore quite correct in *not* ascribing the authorship of the alpha-aphors to him. The *fourteen* aphors are thus the product of a pre-Pāṇini age; these aphors describe a dialect which possessed only seven short monophs and two diphthongs, and which had, besides, no lack of words containing the vowel *ṛ* and the semi-vowel *ḷ* in them. The sound of the semi-vowel possibly resembled that of *ayin* in Arab and Hob, and as such must have had a distinct sigh assigned to it, though now irrecoverably lost. The age of Pāṇini is thus conspicuous by the loss of the sign of the semi-vowel *ḷ*, and by the scarcity of the vowel *ṛ*, the former event having led to the confounding of the semi-vowel *ḷ* with the spir *h*, while the latter led to the non-recognition of the vowel *ṛ*. The age of the composition of the Fourteen Alpha-aphors, recognising the seven short monophs, two diphthongs and the semi-vowel *ḷ*, may be called Pre-Pāṇini Age I.

The age of Pāṇini will be found conspicuous not only by the loss of one short vowel *ṛ*, but of three more short vowels, *ā, ē, and ō*.

लृ may claim at least a few words, while the semi-vowel ॠ has not been ousted from the premier place, though no words have been preserved for it to claim. But the short vowels अ, ए and ओ, to use a scientific expression, have evaporated *without residue*. Śākāṭyāyana knew two *ys* and two *us*, the one *light* and the other *heavy*. Pāṇini makes mention of Śākāṭyāyana having known them; but as to whether any distinction was made between them, when he (Pāṇini) lived, absolutely nothing is known. This age of short अ and of the two-fold यृ and ॠ may be called the Pre-Pāṇini Age II.”<sup>1</sup>

**24. Samskrta.** Here then the Samskrit language had assumed a shape true to its name Samskr̥ta. The later epics, poems and dramas do not show any progress in the grammar, structure and signification of the language, though as regards style, they class themselves into an isolated species of literary composition. For all practical purposes, the language as perfected by the work of Kāṭyāyana and Paṇjali has been the standard of later literature, and these are now the acknowledged authorities on all points concerning the grammar or construction of the Sanskrit speech.

अव्याकृता देवभाषा काले व्याकृतिसमजत् । तदानीं “संस्कृतं” अमिहितम् । दाण्डिना तु “संस्कृतं नाम देवी वाग-वक्ष्याता महर्षिभिः” (काव्यादर्शे १।३३), इत्युक्त्वा देवी वागेव प्रकृतिप्रलयविभागाख्यसंस्काररूपेण संस्कृतभाषेति व्याख्यातम् ।

वाग्मटालङ्कारे च ( २।३ ) स्पष्टतः ध्वनितम्—

“संस्कृतं स्वर्णिनां भाषा शब्दशस्त्रेषु निश्चिता ।” उक्ता संस्कृतभाषा भूमण्डले सर्वैरेव सर्वत्र प्रज्ञाता । तथा च, ऋग्वेदीयकौषीतकिब्राह्मणे ७।६, —“पथ्या स्वस्तिः तस्माद् उदीच्यां दिशि प्रज्ञाततरा वाग् उच्यते । यो वा तत आगच्छति तस्य वा शुभ्रवर्णः इति ह स्माह एषा हि वाचो दिक् प्रज्ञाता ।” इति

**25.** “The earliest literature presents a fluent and simple style of composition. The sentences are short and verbal forms are abundant. Attributive and nominal expressions do not find a place therein. This construction is facilitated by a succession of concise ideas, which gives it a sort of simple grace and fine-cut structure. This then is the form of the Brahmana language. It lacks not striking thoughts, bold expression and impressive reasoning. Leaving out of account the unnatural appearance of the sutra style—which was not however a literary composition—we come to Yaska and his Nirukṭa. Scientific as it is, the language of Yaska often reminds us of the earlier writings. The

1. R. R. Bhagwat, *Lectures on Sanskrit's Language*, Bombay.

frequency of verbal forms was current during the time of Panini. It was after the epoch of the Ashtadhyayi that a change had come over literary styles. Attributes attracted greater attention, and compounds could alone compress long dependent sentences into the needed form. 'In argument the ablative of an abstract noun saves a long periphrasis.' The minute rules of Panini for constructing the innumerable verbal forms facilitated this mania for conciseness of expression. Thus the fluent or simple style came gradually to be displaced by the formative or attributive style. To this was added the richness and flexibility of the Sanskrit language itself, which allowed any sort of twisting and punning of the literary vocabulary. The Puranas and the Itihasas were composed at the transitional stage in the history of literary styles. They present at the same time the simplicity of the earlier language and the complexity of the later composition. So do the earliest specimens of poetic and dramatic literature. Hence the natural and not improbable conclusion is that if an author shows an easy and elegant style and if the flow of his language is more natural, it must be either his taste is too æsthetic for his age or his work must be assigned to an early period in the history of literature. This artificial style was greatly developed in the field of philosophy and dialectics. Patanjali's language is most simple, lucid and impressive. The sentences if therefore really consists of a series of dialogues, often smart, between one who maintains the *pūrvaapaksha*, and another who plays down the *siddhānta*. Hence, the language is plain and simple, and the sentences are short, and such as a man may naturally use in ordinary conversation or oral disputation.

The forms of words are all similar to the earlier dramas or the Puranas. Sabarāswamin has a lively style, though this presents a further stage in the downward progress. Now the philosophical style sets in and continues to a degree of mischief which is now beyond all reformation. Sankara represents the middle stage. His explanations are aided by dialectic terminology. The sentences are much longer than those of the earlier writers, the construction is more involved, there is a freer use of attributive adjuncts, and the form is that of an essay or a lecture, instead of an oral disputation. But his language is fluent and perspicuous, but not petrified as that of later writers. The last stage is reached in the works of the Naiyāyikas. These latter hate the use of verbs. The ablative singular and the indeclinable particles play a prominent part in their composition. Nouns are abstract and even participles are rare. The style is one of solidified formulæ, rather of

varying discourse. Thus the end is that the movement which started with the simple sentence and predicative construction has run up to a stage where the original character is entirely modified and the Sanskrit language has become a language of abstract nouns and compound words.

The greater use of attributive or nominal forms of expression gradually drove out a large portion of the Sanskrit verb, and gave a new character to the language, which may be thus described:—Very few verbal forms are used besides those of such tenses as the Present and Future; participles are frequently met with; the verbal forms of some roots, especially of those belonging to the less comprehensive classes, have gone out of use, and in their place we often have a noun expressive of the special action and a verb expressive of action generally; compound words are somewhat freely employed and a good many of the Taddhita forms or nominal derivatives have disappeared, and in their stead we have periphrastic expressions.

**26. Spiritual Aspect.** “The grammatical dissertations of the Hindus were not confined to a narrow field, nor were the Hindu grammarians content with mere formulation of rules for the formation of words. The spiritual aspect of sound seems to have made a deep impression upon their mind and left its stamp on their whole outlook regarding *śabda*. The śabdikas succeeded in discovering a way of spiritual discipline even through the labyrinthine mass of grammatical speculations. Enquiries into the ultimate nature of *vak* led them to a sublime region of *sādhana*—a region of perfect bliss and pure consciousness. The cultivation of grammar gave rise to a spiritual vision which, to speak, enabled the *vag-yogavīd* to visualise Brahman in the wreath of letters (*varṇamālā*). Letters are denoted in Sanskrit by the same term (*akṣara*) as is often applied to Brahman. A glance at the language in which *akṣara* has been interpreted by grammarians of old will serve to open our eyes to the supreme importance of *varṇas*. To the spiritual insight of Patañjali *varṇas* were not only phonetic types but the glowing sparks of Brahman illumining the entire sphere of existence :

वर्णज्ञानं वाग्विषयो यत्र च ब्रह्म वर्तते । Vārṇika.

सौख्यमक्षरसामान्यायो वाक्समाम्नायः पुष्पितः फलितश्चन्द्रनारकवत् • प्रतिमण्डितो वेदितव्यो ब्रह्मराशिः । Mahābhāṣya, I. 2. 3.

The study of grammar has been declared to be the direct means of attaining the Supreme Being who, though one and without a second,

appears to be manifold owing to the operation of maya.<sup>3</sup> Grammar in its religious and mystical speculations is in line with the teachings of the Upanisads, reinterpreting the same doctrines of yoga and upasana as are generally found in the sacred texts of India.<sup>4</sup>

It was left to Patanjali and his followers to unlock the portal of a new kingdom of thought, so as to throw light upon the ultimate end of all enquiries into words. The Mahabhasya portended the birth of a form of sadhana in which sabda or Eternal Verbum should be worshipped with all the reverence shown to a Divinity.<sup>5</sup> In order to attain union with Brahman or to get oneself completely merged in the Absolute, one is directed to take up the mysterious course of Sabda-sadhana.<sup>6</sup> Patanjali seems to have been the first among the Indian grammarians to give a spiritualistic colour to the speculations of grammar. The sabdabrahmopasana, as is formulated in the Upanisads, had undoubtedly influenced his trend of thought.

The mysticism underlying the phenomena of speech was undoubtedly the aspect which seems to have made the deepest impression upon the grammarian. The utterance of sound is with him a vivid materialisation of inner consciousness. To the grammarian sabda is not a lifeless mechanism invented by man. It is more than a mere sound or symbol. It is consciousness that splits itself up into the twofold category of sabda and artha; and what we call vak, as the vehicle of communication, is nothing but an expression of *cailanya* lying within.<sup>7</sup> Patanjali has taken notice of two kinds of words, namely, *nitya* (eternal) and *karya* (created). By the former he understands the Supreme Reality that transcends all limitations of time and space. The attributes whereby the Vedantin describes Brahman or Absolute

1. यदेकं प्रक्रियामेदैर्बहुधा प्रविमज्यते ।

तद्व्याकरणमागम्य परं ब्रह्माधिगम्यते ॥ Vākyapādiya.

2. तस्य वाचकः प्रणवः तज्जपस्तदर्थमावनम् ॥ Yoga sūtras, 27-28.

3. Patanjali says that one should pursue the study of grammar for the supreme object of attaining equality or sameness with the Great God :

महता देवेन नस्साम्यं यथा स्यादित्यध्येयं व्याकरणम् ।

4. While commenting on the Rk (Rgveda, X. 6, 71), Patanjali had laid stress on the necessity of making a thorough study of grammar, because it renders the grammarian capable of attaining union with Brahman (सायुज्यानि जानते)

5. प्रत्यक्चैतन्यस्यान्तरसंविष्टस्य परबोधनाव आतिरमिष्यन्दति इति ।—Pūnyarāja under Vākyapādiya, I. 1.

have all been used by Patanjali in this interpretation of *nitya sabda*.<sup>1</sup> He has more than once drawn our attention to this eternal character of *sabda*. This will give us some idea of the magnitude in which *sabda* was understood by the famous grammarian whom tradition makes an incarnation of *Sesa*. His poetical description of *varnas*, to which we have already referred, best illustrates the spiritual outlook of his mind. From the *srutis* he has quoted in laudation of *vak* and *vyakarana*, and it is sufficiently clear that he was an ardent and devout worshipper of *vak*, belonging to that class of mystics who in their spiritual experience make no distinction between *para vak* and *para Brahman*. Patanjali used to look upon *sabda* as a great divinity (*mahan devah*) that makes its presence felt by every act of utterance. He was a yogin whose inward vision (*pratibha jnana*) permitted him to have a look into that eternal flow of pure consciousness that is undisturbed from outside.<sup>2</sup> He was a true type of Brahmin who visualised the ultimate nature of *vak* by dispelling the darkness of ignorance through the aid of his illuminating knowledge of *sabda-tattva*.<sup>3</sup> The worship of *vak*, which has its origin in the Upanisads<sup>4</sup> and which found so prominent an expression in the Agamas, was earnestly followed up by the *sabdikas*, particularly by Patanjali and Bhartrhari. *Sabdabrahmopasana*, as we find in grammatical dissertations, is only a reproduction of the teachings of the Upanisads.<sup>5</sup>

Words are not mere sounds as they ordinarily seem to be. They have a subtle and intellectual form within. The internal source from which they evolve is calm and serene, eternal and imperishable. The real form of *vak*, as opposed to external sound, lies far beyond the range of ordinary perception. We are told that it requires a good deal of *sadhana* to have a glimpse of the purest form of speech. The *ruk* to which Patanjali has referred bears strong evidence to this fact. *Vak* is said to reveal her divine self only to those who are so trained

1. नित्येषु च कण्ठेषु कूटस्थैरविचालिभिर्वर्णैः सवितन्वमनपायोपजनविकारिभिः ।—*Mahābhāṣya*, I, 1, 1.

2. अन्या परा प्रकृतिः सत्त्वा सर्वविकारादुपायिनी प्रशान्तकल्लोला चिदेकघना ब्रह्मा ह्लासमवादिनः ।—*Haradja* under *Vākya*, *adīya*, 3. 32.

3. वैवाकरवस्तु शास्त्रबलेन तद्वल्लब्धयोगेन च गुहान्वकारं विदार्य सर्वं जानातीति भावः ।—*Pradīpoddīpita*.

4. नमो वाचं ब्रह्मत्युपास्ते ।—*Chāndogya*, VII, 2.

5. स्वेकन्तमाप्नोति जयं परत्र ।—*Mahābhāṣya*.

as to understand her real nature. Such was the exalted nature of vak upon which the grammarian used to meditate.”<sup>1</sup>

**27. Writing.** IT HAS BEEN SAID THAT ANCIENT INDIA KNEW NO WRITING and that writing was introduced somewhere about 1800 B.C., by traders coming into India from Phœnicia and Mesopotamia. The Vedas were meant for recital and the bards sang the hymns. The idea involved in the name *śruṭi* for the Vedas is recitation and ‘hearing,’ for it is the sound waves started by the voice regulated by intonations that create the mystic or magnetic effect. Indeed, there is a species of work called Vedaprayoga wherein the use of particular hymns for specific objects is prescribed. Such, for instance, are hymns for getting a sprout of water from barren ground or for driving out evil spirits or for promoting easy delivery.

The various *aśtras* ranging from Brahmāṣṭra, the most infalliable one, are mere mantras and when Visvāmiṭra initiated Rāma into *aśtras*, he taught *mantra-grāma*.<sup>2</sup> From the circumstance that Vedic hymns were used for recitals, it cannot be said that the Vedic age had no script. It is the tradition that Viṣṇuśvara wrote all Mahābhārata to Vyāsa’s dictation. The sages who were omniscient and who could foresee and create things supernatural would not have failed to have a means of recording their ideas and expressions for the benefit of posterity.

Ṛg-Veda (I. 164, 94, IX. 13-3) uses the word *akṣara*. The word *sūtra* found on the Maṇḍūkānda of the Brāhmapas of White Yajus signifies a metaphorical use of the *sūtra* proper, meaning ‘thread’ or band. Goldstücker in his *Study of Panini* distinctly expressed that the words *sūtra* and *grantha* ‘must absolutely be connected with writing.’ Panini<sup>3</sup> explained the formation of the word *Yavanānī* and Kātyāyana’s Vārṭika says that the noun ‘*lipi*’ (writing) must be supplied to signify the writing of the Yavanas.<sup>4</sup>

1. P. C. Chakravarti, *Spiritual Outlook of Sanskrit Grammar*, (Jl. of Dep. of Letters, Calcutta, 1934).

2. मंत्रग्रामे गृहाण त्वं बलामतिबलां तथा ।  
ददौ रामाय सुप्रीतो मंत्रग्राममनुत्तमम् ॥ 1. 22. 12.

\* \* \*

जपतस्तु युचेस्तस्य विश्वामितस्य धीमतः ।

उपतस्थुर्महाहर्षिणि सर्वाण्यस्त्राणि राघवम् ॥ 1. 27. 23-23

3. *Panini*, 36 ; Maxmüller, *ISL*, V. 20, 24 ; II. 26 ; Weber, *ILr*, 15, 221.

4. *ISL*, V. 5-8, 17; IV. 89.



Paṭanjali has a long discussion on Akṣara thus :

अक्षरं न क्षरं विद्यादश्रोतेर्वा सरोक्षरम् ।

न क्षीयते न क्षरतीति वाक्षरम् ॥

अश्रोतेर्वा पुनरयमौणादिकः सरन् प्रलयः ।

अश्रुते इत्यक्षरम् ।

वर्णं वाहुः पूर्वसूत्रे अथवा पूर्वसूत्रे वर्णस्याक्षरमिति संज्ञा क्रियते ।

किमर्थमुपदिश्यते ?

वर्णज्ञानं नाविषयो यत्र च ब्रह्म वर्तते ।

तदर्थमिष्टबुद्ध्यर्थं लब्ध्वर्थं चोपदिश्यते ॥

Of the Northern Indian scripts descended from the Brāhmī is Nāgari or Ḍevanāgari and the alphabets of that script are the formulæ of Maheśvarasūtras, making up vowels अच् and consonants हल्.

A study of paleography has come to distinguish the types of early writings Kharoshthi and Brāhmī. The former was current in Gāndhāra (East Afghanistan and North Punjab) and was borrowed from the Aramaic type of Semitic writing in use during the fifth century B.C. The latter, Brahmi is "the true national writing of India, because all late Indian alphabets are descended from it, however dissimilar they may appear at the present day."<sup>2</sup>

**28. History.** It has been said that the Hindus possess no national history. Max Muller accepts this proposition as a postulate, builds on it and explains the so-called absence of anything like historical literature among the Hindus to their being a nation of philosophers :

1. For Philology, language and paleography generally, see the following :—

*Origin of Devanagari Alphabet*, (IA, XXXV, 253, 270, 311); *Dravidian elements in Sanskrit dictionaries* (IA, I, 235); *Hindu Science of Grammar* (IA, XIV, 33); *On Kharoshthi writing* (IA, XXIV, 285-311; XXXIII, 79; XXXIV, 1, 25, 45); *Progress Report of Linguistic Survey of India* (IA, XLI, 179); *Scripts and Signs from Indian Neolithes*, (IA, XLVIII, 57); *Philological position of Sanskrit in India* (IA, XVIII, 124; XXIV, 81; XIV, 83).

A. A. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar*; Hans Raj, *Vedic Kosa*; M. S. Ghata, *Lectures on Rig-veda*; P. D. Gune, *Introduction to Comparative Philology*; S. K. Belvalkar, *Systems of Sanskrit Grammar*; W. D. Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*; F. Klahorn, *Grammar of Sanskrit Language*; A. Carnoy, *Grammaire*; A. Weber, *Indischen Philologie in Ist*, III; E. Windisch, *Geschichte der Sanskrit Philologie*; Hornle, *JASB*, LIX, No. 2; Waddell, *On the use of Paper*, *JRAS*, (1914) 136; Haraprasad Sastri, *Rep.* I, 7; Bhaudarkar, *POCP*, II, 305; Buhler, *Indian Paleography and The Origin of Brahmi Alphabet*; Isaac Taylor, *The Alphabet*.

"Greece and India are, indeed, the two opposite poles in the historical development of the Aryan man. To the Greek, existence is full of life and reality; to the Hindu, it is a dream, a delusion. The Greek is at home where he is born; all his energies belong to his country; he stands or falls with his party, and is ready to sacrifice even his life to the glory and independence of Hellas. The Hindu enters this world as a stranger; all his thoughts are directed to another world; he takes no part even where he is driven to act; and when he sacrifices his life, it is but to be delivered from it."<sup>1</sup>

But A. Stein in his Introduction to *Rājaṣarangiṇī* has thus answered it: "It has often been said of the India of the Hindus that it possessed no history. The remark is true if we apply it to history as a science and art, such as classical culture in its noblest prose-works has bequeathed it to us. But it is manifestly wrong if by history is meant either historical development or the materials for studying it. India has never known, amongst its Śāstras, the study of history such as Greece and Rome cultivated or as modern Europe understands it. Yet the materials for such study are equally at our disposal in India. They are contained not only in such original sources of information as Inscriptions, Coins and Antiquarian remains, generally; advancing research has also proved that written records of events or of traditions concerning them have by no means been wanting in ancient India.

H. H. Wilson in his admirable Introduction to his translation of the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, while dealing with the contents of the Third Book observes that a very large portion of the contents of the *Itihāsas* and *Purāṇas* is genuine and writes:—

"The arrangement of the Vedas and other writings considered by the Hindus—being, in fact, the authorities of their religious rites and beliefs—which is described in the beginning of the Third book, is of much importance to the History of the Hindu Literature and of the Hindu religion. The sage Vyasa is here represented not as the author but the arranger or the compiler of the Vedas, the *Itihāsas* and the *Purāṇas*. His name denotes his character meaning the 'arranger' or 'distributor'; and the recurrence of many Vyasas, many individuals who remodelled the Hindu scriptures, has nothing in it, that is improbable, except the fabulous intervals by which their labours are separated. The re-arranging, the 're-fashioning', of old materials is nothing more than the progress of time would be likely to render necessary. The

last recognised compilation is that of Krishna Dvaipayana, assisted by Brahmans, who were already conversant with the subjects respectively assigned to them. They were the members of the college or school supposed by the Hindus to have flourished in a period more remote, no doubt, than the truth, but not at all unlikely to have been instituted at some time prior to the accounts of India which we owe to Greek writers and in which we see enough of the system to justify our inferring that it was then entire. That there have been other Vyāsas and other schools since that date, that Brahmans unknown to fame have re-modelled some of the Hindu scriptures, and especially the Puranas, cannot reasonably be counted, after dispassionately weighing the strong internal evidence, which all of them afford, of their intermixture of unauthorized and comparatively modern ingredients. But the same internal testimony furnishes proof equally decisive, of the anterior existence of ancient materials; and it is, therefore, as idle as it is irrational, to dispute the antiquity or the authenticity of the contents of the Puranas, in the face of abundant positive and circumstantial evidence of the prevalence of the doctrines, which they teach, the currency of the legends which they narrate, and the integrity of the institutions which they describe at least three centuries before the Christian Era. But the origin and development of their doctrines, traditions and institutions were not the work of a day; and the testimony that establishes their existence three centuries before Christianity, carries it back to a much more remote antiquity, to an antiquity, that is, probably, not surpassed by any of the prevailing fictions, institutions or beliefs of the ancient world."

Again, in dealing with the contents of the Fourth Amśa of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, the Professor remarks :—

"The Fourth Book contains all that the Hindus have of their Ancient History. It is a tolerably comprehensive list of dynasties and individuals; it is a barren record of events. It can scarcely be doubted, however, that much of it is a genuine chronicle of persons, if not of occurrences. That it is discredited by palpable absurdities in regard to the longevity of the princes of the earlier dynasties, must be granted; and the particulars preserved of some of them are trivial and fabulous. Still there is an artificial simplicity and consistency in the succession of persons, and a possibility and probability in some of the transactions, which give to these traditions the semblance of authenticity, and render it likely that these are not altogether without foundation. At any rate, in the absence of all other sources of information the record, such

as it is, deserves not to be altogether set aside. It is not essential to its celebrity or its usefulness, that any exact chronological adjustment of the different reigns should be attempted. Their distribution amongst the several Yugas, undertaken by Sir William Jones, or his Pandits, finds no countenance from the original texts, rather than an identical notice of the age in which a particular monarch ruled or the general fact that the dynasties prior to Krishna precede the time of the Great War and the beginning of the Kali Age, *both which events are placed five thousand years ago* ..... This, may, or may not, be too remote ; but it is sufficient, in a subject where precision is impossible, to be satisfied with the general impression, that, in the dynasties of Kings detailed in Puranas, we have a record, which, although it cannot fail to have suffered detriment from age, and may have been injured by careless or injudicious compilation, preserves an account not wholly undeserving of confidence, of the establishment and succession of regular monarchies, amongst the Hindus, from as early an era, and for as continuous a duration, as any in the credible annals of mankind."

And lastly, in discussing the general nature of the Purāṇas and of their values as historical records, he says :—

"After the date of the Great War, the Vishnu Purana, in common with other Puranas, which contain similar lists, specifies Kings and Dynasties with greater precision, and offers political and chronological particulars to which, on the score of probability there is nothing to object. In truth, their general accuracy has been incontrovertibly established. Inscriptions on columns of stone, on rocks, on coins, deciphered only of late years through the extraordinary ingenuity and perseverance of Mr. James Prinsep, have verified the names of races and titles of princes—the Gupta and the Andhra Rajas mentioned in the Puranas."

29. In his Rajasthan, Col. Tod says :—

"Those who expect from a people like the Hīndus a species of composition of precisely the same character as the historical works of Greece and Rome, commit the very egregious error of overlooking the peculiarities which distinguish the natives of India from all other races, and which strongly discriminate their intellectual productions of every kind from those of the West. Their philosophy, their poetry, their architecture are marked with traits of originality ; and the same may be expected to pervade their history, which, like the arts enumerated,

took a character from its intimate association with the religion of the people.

In the absence of regular and legitimate historical records, there are, however, other native works, (they may, indeed, be said to abound) which, in the hands of a skilful and patient investigator, would afford no despicable materials for the history of India. The first of these are the Puranas and genealogical legends of the princes which, obscured as they are by the mythological details, allegory, and improbable circumstances, contain, many facts that serve as beacons to direct the research of the historian."

30. "Another species of historical records is found in the accounts given by the Brahmins of the endowments of the temples, their dilapidation and repairs, which furnish occasions for the introduction of historical and chronological details. In the legends respecting places of pilgrimage and religious resort, profane events are blended with superstitious rites and ordinances, local ceremonies and customs. The controversies of the Jains furnish, also, much historical information, especially with reference to Guzerat and Nehrvala during the Chauluc dynasty. From a close and attentive examination of the Jain records, which embody all that those ancient sectarians knew of science, many chasms in Hindu history might be filled up."

"Every MATHA or religious college of any importance preserves the succession of its heads. Among the Jains, we have the PATAVALIS or successions of pontiffs, for a full and lucid notice of some of which we are indebted to Dr. Hoernle: they purport to run back to even the death of the last TIRTHAMKARA Vardhamana-Mahavira."

31. "The preservation of pedigrees and successions has evidently been a national characteristic for very many centuries. And we cannot doubt that considerable attention was paid to the matter in connection with the royal families and that Vamsavalis or Rajavalis, lists of the lineal successions of kings, were compiled and kept from very early times. We distinctly recognise the use of such VAMSAVALIS,—giving the relationships and succession of kings, but no chronological details beyond the record of the total duration of each reign with occasionally a coronation-date recorded in an era,—in the copper-plate records. We trace them, for instance, in the introductory passages of the grants of the Eastern Chalukya Series<sup>1</sup> which, from the period A.D. 918 to 925 onwards, name the successive kings beginning with the founder of

---

1. See *SII*, I. 35; *EI*, V. 131.

the line who reigned three centuries before that time, but do not put forward more than the length of the reign of each of them; and, from certain differences in the figures for some of the reigns, we recognise that there were varying recensions of those VAMSAVALIS. We trace the use of the VAMSAVALIS again in the similar records of the Eastern Gangas of Kalinga, which, from A.D. 1058 onwards,<sup>2</sup> give the same details about the kings of that line with effect from about A.D. 990, and one of which, issued A.D. 1296,<sup>2</sup> includes a coronation-date of A.D. 1141 or 1142. There has been brought to light from Nepal a long VAMSAVALI, which purports to give an unbroken list of the rulers of that country, with the lengths of their reigns and an occasional landmark in the shape of the date of an accession stated in an era, back from A.D. 1768 to even so fabulous an antiquity as six or seven centuries before the commencement of the Kali age in B.C. 3102."

32 In his Rājataranginī,<sup>3</sup> KALHANA mentions certain previous writers,—“Suvrata, whose work, he says, was made difficult by misplaced learning; Kshemendra, who drew up a list of kings, of which, however, he says, no part is free from mistakes; Nilamuni, who wrote the NILAMATA-PURANA; Helaraja, who composed a list of kings in twelve thousand verses; and Srimihira or Padmamihira, and the author of the SEICHCHAVYALA. His own work, he tells us, was based on eleven collections of RAJAKATHAS or stories about kings and on the work of Nilamuni,”

“Tamrasasana, or “copper-chapters” consist sometimes of a single plate, but more usually of several plates strung together on a large signet-ring which bears generally the seal of the authority who issued the particular chapter. The stone records usually describe themselves by the name of *Silāsasana*, ‘Stone-chapters,’ *Sila-lekha*, ‘Stone-writings,’ or *Prasasti*, ‘Eulogies.’ They are found on rocks, on religious columns such as those which bear some of the edicts of

1. *RI*, IV. 188.

2. *JASB*, LXV. 329.

3. Kalhana made use of :

(i) प्रतिष्ठासासन, edicts—inscriptions regarding the creation or consecration of temples etc.

(ii) वस्तुसासन, edicts—inscription recording grants, chiefly of grants and allowances engrossed on copper plates.

(iii) प्रशस्तिपट्ट, tables containing laudatory inscriptions or praises.

(iv) साक्ष, works on various sciences.

Priyadasi and others which were set up in front of temples as "flag-staffs" of the Gods, on battle-columns or columns of victory such as the two at Mandasor, on the walls and beams and pillars of caves and temples, on the pedestals of images, and on slabs built into the walls of temples or set up in the courtyards of temples or in conspicuous places in village-sites or fields. And they are often accompanied by sculptures which give the seal of the authority issuing the record, or mark its sectarian nature, or illustrate some scene referred to in it."

**33. The Chronology of Classical Sanskrit Literature** starts with Mahabhārata war and Kaliyuga. Kaliyuga commenced on 18th February 3102 B.C., just on the day on which Śrī Kṛṣṇa departed to his divine abode. The Kuru-Pāṇḍava war was fought 37 years before Kali, that is in 3139 B.C. Onwards from the commencement of Kaliyuga, Purāṇas contain accounts of various kingdoms that flourished from time to time and successive dynasties that ruled and fell during the course of about 35 centuries. To an impartial observer the tenor of these accounts warrants their accuracy and to the mind of the Hindus—the Hindus of those bygone ages, when scepticism had not called tradition superstition—life here is evanescent and life's endeavour must be the attainment of beatitude eternal. Ancient sages (ṛṣis) perceived the divine hymns of the Vedas and passed them on for the edification of posterity. Since the advent of Kali, a prospective crop of vice and folly was predicated and to wean the erring world from such sin and misery, Vyāsa formulated Purāṇas, with the object of Vedopabṛhmaṇa वेदोप ब्रह्मण, that is, supplemented the exposition of Vedic teachings, and that in the garb of a language and narrative that would be easily assimilated by the masses. To such philosophical minds, the rise and fall of kings and kingdoms was not worth remembrance, save as another realistic means of illustrating the tenets of philosophy, e.g., the truth of the divine essence, Brahman, the unreality of sensual pleasures, the liberation of individual soul and the attainment of eternity in beatitude or oneness with the Spirit Divine and above all the inevitable occurrence of God's mandates shortly termed Destiny or otherwise called Kāla or Niyati.

If this is the object of Puranic literature, it is a sacrilegious charge the author or authors of them, whoever it was, with having fabricated scriptural testimony for attributing an antiquity to Indian literature and Indian civilization, which it did not possess; for even if they had been, as many orientalisists have said, made up late after the Christian era,

the authors could not have anticipated this method of study of political history of the 18th and 19th centuries A.D. The Purāṇic lists of dynasties of kings and kingdoms furnish details of dates to an extent that even in days of historical records may be surprising, for they mention even months and days in their computation. Whatever those ancient authors did or wrote, they did it with sincerity and accuracy; 'truth' being the basis of accuracy. Our educational institutions are saturated with the teachings of modern scholars on the untruth of these Purāṇic accounts, but it is still hoped that time will come when truth will triumph and display a real orientation of ancient Indian History.<sup>1</sup>

**34.** Of the several kingdoms and dynasties of which Purāṇas have recorded political history, there is the kingdom of Magaḍha. For our present purposes of sifting and settling the chronology of India up to the Christian era the history of Magaḍha is particularly relevant, for it is at Magadha, 'Chandragupta' and 'Aśoka' ruled and it is on these names that the modern computation of dates has been based for everything relating to India's literary history and it is those two names that make the heroes of the theory of *Anchor Sheet of Indian Chronology*.

**35. The Kingdom of Magadha** was founded by Bṛhadraṭha, son of Uparicara Vasu, the 6th in descent from Kuru, of the Candṛa Vamśa. That happened 161 years before Mahābhārata war. Tenth in descent from Bṛhadraṭha was, Jarāsaṇḍha. Jarāsaṇḍha perished at the hand of Kamsa and in his place Sahaḍeva was installed on the throne. Sahaḍeva was an ally of Pāṇḍavas and was killed in the war, that is in 3139 B.C. His son Marjāri (or Somāḍhi or Somaviṭ) was his successor and the first king of Magaḍha after the war. From him 22 kings of this Bārhadraṭha dynasty ruled over Magaḍha for 1006 years, or roughly stated, for 1000 years.<sup>2</sup>

For instance, Maṭṣya Purāṇa says:—

द्वाविंशतिनृपा ज्येते भवितारौ बृहद्रथाः ।

पूर्णं वर्षसहस्रं तु तेषां राज्यं भविष्यति ॥ 169, 30

Ripunjaya was the last king of this dynasty. He was assassinated

1. F. E. Pargiter has given an admirable summary of *Early Indian Traditional History* as recorded in Puranas in *JRAS* (1914) 267 *et seq.*

2. See K. P. Jayasval, *Bṛhadraṭha Chronology*, *JLORS*, IV, 1; Sitānāth Pradhān, *Chronology of Ancient India*, Calcutta; Hemchandra Raychaudhuri, *Political History of India from the accession of Periksit to the extinction of the Gupta dynasty*, Calcutta.



by Pulaka and Pulaka succeeded to the throne. His son was Praḍyōṭa or Bālaka. Thus came the PRADYOTA or BALAKA DYNASTY in 2133 B.C.

Thus Maṭṣya Purāṇa says :—

बृहद्रथेऽवर्ततेपु वीतिहोत्रेऽववन्तिपु ।

पुलकः स्वामिने हत्वा स्वपुत्रमभिषेक्षति ॥ १ ॥

मिशतां क्षत्रियाणान्तु बालकः पुलकोद्भवः ।

स वै प्रणतसामन्तो भविष्यो नयवर्जितः ॥ २ ॥

“When the Bārhadrathas, the Vitiḥōtras and the Avantins have passed away, Pulaka after killing his master (King Ripunḍjaya) will instal his son Bālaka as King. Bālaka, the son of Pulaka, will, in the very sight of the Kshattriyas of his time, subjugate these neighbouring kings by force and will be devoid of royal policy.”

36. Instead of crowning himself as king against the wishes of the people, Pulaka got the only daughter of Ripunḍjaya married to his son Praḍyōṭa and installed him on the throne.

There were 5 kings of this dynasty<sup>1</sup> and they ruled for 138 years (1995 B.C.). Viṣṇu Purāṇa says :—

... .. पञ्च प्रद्योतना इमे ।

अष्टत्रिंशोत्तरशतं मोक्षयन्ति पृथिवीं नृपाः ॥—XII, ii

37. Śiśunāga got in by conquest or usurpation and founded. SISUNAGA DYNASTY in 1995 B.C.<sup>2</sup> There were 10 kings of this dynasty and they ruled for 360 or 362 years i.e., 1635 B.C. Thus Vāyu Purāṇa says :—

इत्येते भवितारो वै शैशुनागा नृपा दश ।

शतानि त्रीणि वर्षाणि द्विषष्टय्यधिकानि तु ॥

1. Praḍyōṭa (23), Bālaka (24 or 28), Viśakhayupa (50 or 33), Janaka or Suryaka or Bājaka (21 or 31), Nandivardhana (20 or 30).

The periods vary according to the versions of the Purāṇas or their readings. But Maṭṣya Purāṇa makes the period 152 years :

द्विपञ्चाशच्छते भुक्त्वा प्रणष्टा पञ्च ते नृपाः ।

2. Śiśunāga (40), Kākavarṇa (36), Kṣemavarṇa (26, 20 or 36), Kṣatrujas or Kṣemajit (40, 24 or 30), Viḍhisāra or Bimbisāra or Vinḍhyasāra (28 or 33), Ajātsaṭru (27 or 25, or 32 or 52), Darsāka or Darbhaka (24), Udayana or Udayasva, or Ajaya or Udayabhadra (33), Nandivardhana (42 or 40), Mahānandin (43 or 63). It was Udayin that built the city of Kusuma on the Ganges :

उदर्या भविता यस्मात् त्रयस्त्रिंशत् समा नृपः ।

स वै पुरवरं राजा पृथिव्यां कुसुमाद्वयम् ।

गङ्गाया दक्षिणे कूले चतुर्थेऽब्दे करिष्यति ॥

Here ended the ŚISUNAGA DYNASTY in 1635 B.C.

38. Mahāpaḍma known as Nanda was the illegitimate son of Mahānandin, the last king of that dynasty, and came to the throne. He founded the NANDA dynasty in 1635 B.C. He ruled for 88 years and his sons Sumālya and seven others ruled for 12 years until 1635 B.C. This dynasty lasted for 10 years.<sup>1</sup>

Viṣṇu Purāṇa says :

महानन्दिनस्ततः शूद्रागर्भोद्भवोऽतिलुब्धोऽतिबलो महापद्मो नन्दनामा परशुराम  
इवाऽपरोऽखिलक्षत्वान्तकारी भविष्यति ॥२०॥ ततः प्रभृति शूद्रा एवात्र भविष्यन्ति ॥२१॥  
स चैकच्छत्रमनुष्ठंषितशासनो महापद्मः पृथिवीं भोक्ष्यति ॥ २२ ॥ तस्याऽऽद्यौ सुताः  
सुमाल्याद्या भवितारः ॥ २३ ॥ तस्य महापद्मस्याऽनु पृथिवीं भोक्ष्यन्ति ॥ २४ ॥ महापद्म-  
स्तत्पुत्राश्च एकं वर्षशतं ऊनीपतयो भविष्यन्ति ॥ २५ ॥ ततश्च नवैतान्नन्दान् कौटिल्यो  
ब्राह्मणः समुद्धरिष्यति ॥ २६ ॥ तेषामभावे मौर्याः पृथिवीं भोक्ष्यन्ति ॥ २७ ॥ कौटिल्य  
एव चन्द्रगुप्तमुत्पन्नं (नन्दस्वैव मौर्यायां मुरासंज्ञायां सञ्जातम्—इति श्रीधरस्वामी) राज्ये-  
ऽभिषेक्ष्यति ॥ २८ ॥—Amśa, IV Ch. xxiv.

Bhāgavata Purāṇa says :

महानन्दिसुतो राजन् शूद्रागर्भोद्भवो बली ॥ ८ ॥  
महापद्मपतिः कश्चिन्नन्दः क्षत्रविनाशकृत् ।  
ततो नृपा भविष्यन्ति शूद्रप्रायास्त्वधार्मिकाः ॥ ९ ॥  
स एकच्छत्रां पृथिवीमनुष्ठंषितशासनः ।  
शासिष्यति महापद्मो द्वितीय इव मार्गवः ॥ १० ॥  
तस्य चाऽष्टौ भविष्यन्ति सुमाल्यप्रसूताः सुताः ।  
य इमां भोक्ष्यन्ति महीं राजानः स्म शतं समाः ॥ ११ ॥  
नव नन्दान् द्विजः कश्चित्प्रपन्नानुद्धरिष्यति ।  
तेषामभावे जगती मौर्या भोक्ष्यन्ति वै कलौ ॥ १२ ॥  
स एव चन्द्रगुप्तं वै द्विजो राज्येऽभिषेक्ष्यति ।  
तत्सुतो वारिसारस्तु ततश्चाऽशोऽवधर्धनः ॥ ३ ॥

—Skandha XII. Ch. ii.

Vāyu Purāṇa says :

महानन्दिसुतश्चाऽपि शूद्रायां कालसंवृतः ।  
उत्पत्स्येते महापद्मः सर्वक्षत्रान्तको नृपः ॥ ३२६ ॥

1. See K. P. Jayswal, *Śaśunaga and Maurya Chronology*, JBORS, I. i.

ततः प्रभृति राजानो भविष्याः शूद्रयोनयः ।  
 एकराट् स महापद्मो एकच्छत्रो भविष्यति ॥ ३२७ ॥  
 अष्टाशीति तु वर्षाणि पृथिवीं पालयिष्यति ।  
 सर्वक्षत्रमथोद्धृत्य भाविनोऽर्थस्य वै बलात् ॥ ३२८ ॥  
 संहृत्य तत्सुता द्वाष्टौ समा द्वादश ते नृपाः ।  
 महापद्मस्य पर्याये भविष्यन्ति नृपाः क्रमात् ॥ ३२९ ॥  
 उद्धरिष्यति तान् सर्वान् कौटिल्यो वै द्विजर्षभः ।  
 भुक्त्वा महीं वर्षशतं नन्देभ्यः स भविष्यति ॥ ३३० ॥  
 चन्द्रगुप्तं नृपं राज्ये कौटिल्यः स्थापयिष्यति ।  
 चुतुविंशत् समा राजा चन्द्रगुप्तो भविष्यति ॥ ३३१ ॥

—Chapter. XCIX,

Maṭṣya Purāṇa Says :—

महानन्दिसुतश्चापि शूद्रायां कलिकांशजः ॥ १८ ॥  
 उत्पत्स्यते महापद्मः सर्वक्षत्रान्तको नृपः ।  
 ततः प्रभृति राजानो भविष्याः शूद्रयोनयः ॥ १९ ॥  
 एकराट् स महापद्म एकच्छत्रो भविष्यति ।  
 अष्टाशीति स वर्षाणि पृथिवीं पालयिष्यति ॥ २० ॥  
 सर्वक्षत्रमथोत्साद्य भाविनाऽर्थेन नेदितः ।  
 सुमाल्यादिमुता द्वाष्टौ समा द्वादश ते नृपाः ॥ २१ ॥  
 महापद्मस्य पर्याये भविष्यन्ति नृपाः क्रमात् ।  
 उद्धरिष्यति कौटिल्यः समैर्द्वादशभिस्तु तान् ॥ २२ ॥  
 कौटिल्यश्चन्द्रगुप्तं स ततो राष्ट्रेऽभिषेक्ष्यति ।  
 भुक्त्वा महीं वर्षशतं ततो मौर्यान् गमिष्यति ॥ २३ ॥

—Chapter CCLXX.

Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa gives the following account :—

महानन्दिसुतश्चाप्ये शूद्रायां कालसंवृतः ।  
 उत्पत्स्यते महापद्मः सर्वक्षत्रान्तकृन्तृपः ॥ १३९ ॥  
 ततः प्रभृति राजानो भविष्याः शूद्रयोनयः ।  
 एकराट् स महापद्म एकच्छत्रो भविष्यति ॥ १४० ॥  
 अष्टाशीति तु वर्षाणि पृथिवीं पालयिष्यति ।  
 सर्वक्षत्रं समुद्धृत्य भाविनोऽर्थस्य वै बलात् ॥ १४२ ॥

तत्पश्चात् तत्सुता द्वाष्टौ समा द्वादश ते नृपाः ।  
 महापद्मस्य पर्याये भविष्यन्ति नृपाः क्रमात् ॥ १३२ ॥  
 उद्धरिष्यति तान् सर्वान् कौटिल्यो वै द्विजर्षभः ।  
 भुक्त्वा महीं वर्षशतं नरेन्द्रः स भविष्यति ॥ १४३ ॥  
 चन्द्रगुप्तं नृपं राज्ये कौटिल्यः स्थापयिष्यति ।  
 चतुर्विंशत् समा राजा चन्द्रगुप्तो भविष्यति ॥ १४४ ॥

—Updēśghāṭa, Ch. LXXIV.

The following is the description of the Nanda Dynasty as given in the Kaliyuga Rājavṛttānta :—

महानन्देश्च शूद्राय। महिष्यां कलिचोदितः ।  
 उत्पत्स्यते महापद्मो धननन्द इति श्रुतः ॥  
 अतिलुब्धोऽप्यतिबलो सर्वैश्चान्तकृन्नृपः ।  
 ऐश्वराकवांश्च पाञ्चालान् कौरव्याश्चैव हेहयान् ॥  
 कालकानेकलिङ्गाश्च शूरसेनांश्च मैथिलान् ।  
 जित्वा चाङ्ग्यांश्च भूपालान् द्वितीय इव भार्गवः ॥  
 एकराट् स महापद्म एकच्छत्रो भविष्यति ।  
 स कृत्स्नामेव पृथिवीमनुल्लङ्घितशासनः ॥  
 शासिष्यति महापद्मो मध्ये विन्ध्यहिमागयोः ।  
 ततः परं भविष्यन्ति शूद्रप्राया नृपाः कलौ ॥  
 अष्टाशीति तु वर्षाणि पृथिवीं पालयिष्यति ।  
 स वै प्रणतसामन्ता महापद्मो महाबलः ॥  
 तस्य चाऽष्टौ भविष्यन्ति सुमाल्यप्रमुखाः सुताः ।  
 शासिष्यन्ति समाहृत्य समा द्वादश ते नृपाः ॥  
 महापद्मश्च तत्पुत्रा नव नन्दा इति श्रुताः ।  
 भुक्त्वा महीं वर्षशतं क्षयं यास्यन्ति ते नृपाः ॥  
 उद्धरिष्यति तान् सर्वान् चाणक्याख्ये द्विजोत्तमः ।  
 चन्द्रगुप्तं स तद्राज्ये कौटिल्यः स्थापयिष्यति ॥

—Bhāga, III, Ch. ii.

39. “ It will be clear from these numerous extracts quoted in full from the various important Purāṇas, which are practically identical with one another, that the Founder of this Dynasty was Mahāpadma well

known otherwise as Dhana Nanda, that he was the son of Mahānandin, the last of the Śaiśunāga Dynasty, that he was born to that king from a Śūdra wife, that he was most avaricious and powerful, that he extirpated the Kshatriya rulers of his time like a second Paraśurāma the destroyer of the Kshatriyas in the olden times, that he subjugated the different lines of Kings of the Solar and Lunar dynasties who began to rule in the various parts of Northern India from the time of the Mahābhārata War commencing from the Coronation of Yudhishṭhira in the year 3139 B.C., that he became a paramount King and Emperor of the whole of India between the Himalaya and the Vindhya mountains by putting an end to the ancient families of Kings, such as Aikshvākus, Pāṇchālas, Kauravyas, Haihayas, Kālakas, Ekaliṅgas, Śūrasānas, Maithilas etc., who ceased to rule as separate dynasties ever since that time, that he ruled the kingdom under one umbrella for a period of 88 years, that his 8 sons jointly ruled the kingdom for a short period of 12 years, that these Nine Nandas, including the father and his eight sons ruled Magadha altogether for a total period of 100 years from 1635 to 1535 B. C., that these Nandas were extirpated by the Brāhman Chāpakya, well known as Kauṭilya, on account of his crooked and Machiavelian policy, and that he replaced his protege Chandragupta, an illegitimate son of Mahāpadma Nanda by his Śūdrā wife Murā, on the throne of his father."

But Vincent A. Smith chooses to assign to these nine Nandas a total period of only 45 years for their reigns.

**40. Candragupta** came to the throne as the son of Murā; so he was a Maurya and the dynasty which he started was Maurya dynasty. Candragupta's son was Bindusāra and Bindusāra's son was Aśoka or Aśokavarṇhana. An old grantha manuscript of Maṭsya Purāṇa gives this account :

चतुस्त्रिंशत् समा राजा चन्द्रगुप्तो भविष्यति ।

अष्टाविंशतिवर्षाणि भद्रसारस्तु तत्सुतः ॥ २४ ॥

षट्त्रिंशच्च महाराजो भविताऽशोक एव च ।

तस्य पुत्रः कुनालस्तु वर्षाण्यष्टौ भविष्यति ॥ २५ ॥

कुनालसूतुरष्टौ च भविता दशरथस्ततः ।

सप्तानां दशवर्षाणि तत्सुतश्चेन्द्रपालितः ॥ २६ ॥

भविता चाष्टवर्षाणि तत्सुतो हर्षवर्धनः ।

भविता नव वर्षाणि तस्य पुत्रस्तु सम्मतिः ॥ २७ ॥

## INTRODUCTION

त्रयोदश हि वर्षाणि शालिशूको भविष्यति ।  
 भविता सप्तवर्षाणि सोमधर्मा नराधिपः ॥ २८ ॥  
 भविता शतधन्वा तु नव वर्षाणि तत्सुतः ।  
 बृहद्रथस्तु वर्षाणि तस्य पुत्रोऽथ सप्ततिः ॥ २९ ॥  
 इत्येते दश च द्वे च ये भोक्ष्यन्ति वसुधराम् ।  
 शतानि त्रीणि वर्षाणि तेभ्यः शृङ्गान् गमिष्यति ॥ ३० ॥

This version of the Matsya Purāṇa tolerably agrees with that given in the Kaliyuga Rājavṛttānta :—

चन्द्रगुप्तस्ततो मौर्यश्चाणक्येनाऽमिरक्षितः ।  
 चतुर्विंशत् समा राज्यं करिष्यति सुधार्मिकः ॥  
 अष्टाविंशतिवर्षाणि बिन्दुसारो भविष्यति ।  
 षट्त्रिंशत् तु ततो राजा भविताऽशोकवर्धनः ॥  
 सुपार्श्वस्तु तस्याऽथ वर्षाण्यष्टौ भविष्यति ।  
 अष्टौ वर्षाणि तत्पुत्रो मोक्षा वै बन्धुपालितः ॥  
 बन्धुपालितदायादो सप्ततिं चेन्द्रपालितः ।  
 भविता नव वर्षाणि तस्य पुत्रस्तु सङ्गतः ॥  
 त्रयोदश समा राज्यं शालिशूकः करिष्यति ।  
 भविता सप्तवर्षाणि देवधर्मा नरर्षभः ॥  
 ततः शतधन् राजा भविताऽष्टौ समा भुवि ।  
 बृहद्रथस्तु तत्पुत्रो जरासन्ध इवाऽपरः ॥  
 क्षत्रियानखिलान् जित्वा महाराजो भविष्यति ।  
 अष्टादशीति तु वर्षाणि स राष्ट्रं पालयिष्यति ॥  
 द्वादशैते नृपा मौर्याश्चन्द्रगुप्तादयो महीम् ।  
 शतानि त्रीणि भोक्ष्यन्ति दश षट् च समाः कलौ ॥

—Bhāga III, Chapter II

Thus Candraguṇṭha reigned from 1535 to 1501 B.C. for 34 years, Bindusāra from 1501 to 1473 for 28 years and Aśoka from 1473 to 1437 B.C. for 36 years. And in all there were twelve Kings of Maurya dynasty, the last of whom was Bṛhadraṭha.<sup>1</sup>

1. Candraguṇṭha or Bhaḍrasāra or Bhaḍrasāra or Nanḍasāra or Vārisāra (28 or 35); Aśoka or Aśoka-varḍhana (36 or 37); Suyāśas or Supārśva or Kunāla or Kuśāla (8); Daśarāja or Daśapālita (8 or 10); (6) Indrapālita (7 or 10); Harṣa or Harṣavarḍhana (8), (8) Saṅga or Saṃmati or Saṃrati (9); Śāliśuka (18); Somadharman or Devadharman or Devavarman or Dāsavarman (7); Śaṭadharman or Śaṭadhara (8 or 9); Bṛhadraṭha or Bṛhadāśva (37 or 70 or 7).

Regarding this dynasty the readings and versions of the Purāṇas are hopelessly confused and incorrect but the passages quoted, of which the authenticity is doubtless, show that the MAURYA DYNASTY lasted for 316 years from 1535 to 1219 B.C.

41. Pusyamiṭra was the commander-in-chief of Bṛhadraṭha. He removed his master and ascended the throne. Thus he started the SUNGA DYNASTY. According to Maṭṣya Purāṇa, there were ten kings of this dynasty who ruled in all for 30 years from 1219 B.C. to 919 B.C. Kāṭyāyana Rājavarṇaṇa says :

पुष्पमित्रस्य सेनानीर्महाबलपराक्रमः ।  
 अतीव वृद्धं राजानं समुद्रुत्य बृहद्रथम् ॥  
 स वै प्रणतसामन्तो युधिष्ठिर इवाऽपरः ।  
 पालयिष्यति धर्मेण समाः षष्टिं महीमिमाम् ॥  
 तस्य पुत्रोऽग्निमित्रस्तु भोक्ता पञ्चाशतं समाः ।  
 तत्सुतो वसुमित्रश्च यवनारिर्महाबलः ॥  
 षट्त्रिंशत्सु समा राज्यं कारयिष्यति वै कलौ ।  
 भविता चाऽपि सृज्येष्टस्तत्सुतो दक्ष सप्त च ॥  
 तत्सुतो मद्रकश्चाऽपि त्रिंशद्वर्षाणि भोक्ष्यति ।  
 पुलिन्दकस्त्वयस्त्रिंशद्वर्षाणि मरुनन्दनः ॥  
 भ्रातृप्वसेयो मद्रस्य महेष्वासोऽरिमर्दनः ।  
 ततो षोडशसुश्चाऽपि द्वीणि वर्षाणि भोक्ष्यति ॥  
 वज्रमित्रस्तु चैकोनत्रिंशतं भविता समाः ।  
 द्वात्रिंशद्वर्षाणि चापि समा भागवतो नृपः ॥  
 भविता तु सुतस्तस्य देवहूतिः समा दक्ष ।  
 योऽयं राजा देवहूतिरावाल्यातु कम्पितस्परः ।  
 निवेश्य राज्यममं स्वामालयवर्षे द्विजोत्तमे ॥  
 विहाय पाटलीपुत्रं विदिशायां सुखास्थितः ।  
 अन्यायेन पुरस्त्रीभिर्विहर्तुमुपचक्रमे ॥  
 कामिनीमाननीयोऽभूत् व्याघ्रवदभ्यप्रक्रमे कृत् ।  
 तुं प्रजा नान्वसोदन्तं शुक्लपृथ्व्योद्भूतम् ॥  
 अक्षैर्धृतैश्च कितवैर्दृष्टो नर्तकसायनैः ।  
 मुरामस्तासुनो भक्तो बभूवसि सङ्गलालसः ॥

स चैकदा वितैः श्रुत्वा वसुदेवस्य मन्त्रिणः ।  
 सुतां महारूपवतीं पद्मिनीलक्ष्णान्विताम् ॥  
 तथा रन्तुं मनश्चक्रे ब्राह्मण्या कालचोदितः ।  
 व्याजेन तां समानीय पत्या सार्धं स्वसन्निधौ ॥  
 गूढं हत्वा निजैश्वरैः साध्यास्तस्याः प्रियं पतिं ।  
 तद्रूपघट्टनिधिं प्राप्य तस्या वासगृहं नृपः ॥  
 हठात्तां धर्षयामास ब्राह्मणीं वरवर्णिनीम् ।  
 साऽपि ज्ञात्वाऽस्य दुर्वृत्तं प्राणान् तत्याज तत्क्षणात् ॥  
 तच्छ्रुत्वा वसुदेवस्तु शोकसन्तप्तमानसः ।  
 त्रिदिग्धामलंकृत्य काञ्चिद्द्वाराङ्गनां द्विजः ॥  
 संप्रेम्य सर्वालङ्कारभूषितां तत्समीपतः ।  
 तथैव घातयामास देवहूतिं नृपाधमम् ॥  
 ननन्दुश्च प्रजाः सर्वाः श्रुत्वा तस्य वधं तथा ।  
 बन्दिरे वसुदेवं च राजानं परया मुदा ॥  
 दैवैते शुङ्गराजानो मोक्षयन्तीमां वसुन्धराम् ॥  
 तत् पूर्णं शते द्वे च तेभ्यः कण्वान् गमिष्यति ॥

Of these kings,<sup>1</sup> it is noteworthy that Puṣyamiṭra is described by Kālidāsa in *Mālavikāgnimiṭra* as the conquerer of Āryāvarta and Agnimiṭra is mentioned by Patañjali as having performed Aśvamedha sacrifice.

“Devahūti, the last king of the Śunga dynasty, having been addicted to a life of pleasure and sexual enjoyment from his boyhood, entrusted the kingdom to the care of his Brahman minister Vasudeva, and he himself retired to Vidiśa, noted in those days for its dancing girls, where he began to lead a most licentious and immoral life with his voluptuary companions, corrupting the fair maidens of the city to satisfy his lust and becoming an object of hatred to his own subjects. On hearing the extraordinary beauty of the daughter of his Brahman minister Vasudeva, who has been living with her husband, he sent for them to come to Vidiśa and live by his side, and on one day, after

1. The kings are:—Puṣyamiṭra or Puṣpamiṭra (36 or 30); Agnimiṭra (50 or 78); Vasumiṭra (36); Sojyāṣṭha (17 or 7); Bhaḍṛaka or Anṭaka or Anḍhraka or Udanka (10 or 30 or 2); Pulindaka or Pulinda (1 or 33); Ghoṣavasū or Ghoṣa (3); Vajramiṭra (29, 14 or 7); Bhāḡavata (32); Devahūti or Devahūti or Kṣemabhumī (10).



secretly disposing of her husband, the king seduced her in the disguise of her husband, and the poor girl who was most true and devoted to her husband, coming to know of the treachery practised by the king, at once gave up her life. On hearing the sad news of the fate of his fair daughter and of her innocent husband, Vasudeva contrived to send to the king a dancing woman, fully furnished with poison, dressed as one of the chief queens and had him killed by her hand. People hailed the death of their licentious king with joy, and made Vasudeva his upright minister, to take charge of the kingdom and rule the country henceforth with Pātaliputra as its capital."

42. Vasudeva of the race of Kaṇva Mahārṣi thus came to the throne of Magadha and started the KANVA DYNASTY. There were four kings in all and they ruled for 85 years from 919 to 834 B.C.<sup>1</sup>

Thus Kaliyuga Rājavṛttānta says :

एवं स लोकदिद्विष्टं देवहूतिं रहो निशि ।  
विषकन्यकया हत्वा वसुदेवो द्विजोत्तमः ॥  
भविष्यति समाश्लिषन्न काण्वायनो नृपः ।  
भूमिभिन्नस्ततो भोक्ता चतुर्विंशतिवत्सरान् ॥  
भविता द्वादश समास्ततो नारायणो नृपः ।  
सुशर्मा तत्सुतश्चापि भविष्यति समा दश ॥  
चत्वार एते भूपालाः कण्वगोत्रमुद्भवाः ।  
धर्मेण मोक्षयन्ति महीं पञ्चाशीतिन्तु वत्सरान् ॥  
सेनाध्यक्षस्तु काण्वानां शातवाहनवंशजः ।  
सिंहकलातिकर्णारण्यः शिपुको वृषलो बली ॥  
समानितैः प्रतिष्ठानादान्ध्रवंश्यैः स्वसैनिकैः ।  
काण्वायनं सुशर्माणं निहत्य स्वाग्निं निजम् ॥  
शुक्लानां चैव यच्छ्रेष्ठं क्षपयित्वा तदप्यसौ ।  
आन्ध्रवंशप्रतिष्ठाता भविष्यति ततो नृपः ॥

43. The last two kings of Kaṇva dynasty were puppets in the hands of the commander-in-chief, Simhaka Svātikarṇa. He slew the last king Suśarmā and ascended the throne of Magadha. He traced his lineage to King Śātavahana of Pratiṣṭhāna and his dynasty was there-

1. Vasudeva (39. 9 or 5); Bhuminiṣṭra or Bhumiṣṭra (14, 24 or 34); Nārāyaṇa (13); Suśarma (10 or 4).

fore called ANDHRAVAMSA. There were 32 kings of this dynasty who ruled for 506 years from 834 to 328 B.C. The last of the kings was Puloman III.<sup>1</sup> The Kaliyuga Rājavṛttānta gives the account.

44. .In SRI GUPTA DYNASTY there were seven kings and they ruled for 245 years from 328 to 83 B.C..<sup>2</sup>

The Kaliyuga Rājavṛttānta given this account :

शिमुकः शातकर्णिस्तु यमाहुर्बलिनं जनाः ।  
 मोक्ष्यत्यन्ध्रमहर्षिं राजा त्रयोविंशतिवत्सरान् ॥  
 कृष्णश्रीशतकर्णिस्तु भ्राता चाऽस्य महायशः ।  
 अष्टादश समा राजा कण्वारुयेन भविष्यति ॥  
 श्रीमद्भ्रातकर्णिस्तु ततो मावी समा दश ।  
 पूर्णोत्सङ्गस्तु भविता वर्षाण्यष्टादशैव हि ॥  
 श्रीशतकर्णिर्भविता समाः पञ्चाशतं च षट् ।  
 स्कन्धस्तम्भी ततो राजा समा द्वादशैव तु ॥  
 दश चाऽष्टौ समा राजा मोक्ता लम्बोदरो महर्षिम् ।  
 अपीतुको दश द्वे च तस्य पुत्रो भविष्यति ॥  
 मेघसातिस्ततो मावि वर्षाण्यष्टादशैव च ।  
 शतसातिस्ततो राजा समा द्वादशैव हि ॥  
 श्रीस्कन्दशतकर्णिस्तु सप्तैव भविता समाः ।  
 मृगेन्द्रशतकर्णिश्च त्रीणि वर्षाणि मोक्ष्यति ॥  
 कुन्तलः शातकर्णिस्तु भविताऽष्टौ समा नृपः ।  
 तथा सौम्यः शातकर्णिर्भविता द्वादशैव तु ॥

1. Simhaka Śrī Śatakarṇi or Śomuka (23) ; Kṛṣṇa (18) ; Śrīmalla (10, 18 or 56) ; Puruṣoṅga (18) ; Śrīśātakarṇi (56 or 40) ; Skandhasaṁbhin (18) , Lambodara (18) ; Apīṭaka or Apīlaka or Vikāla (12) ; Meghasvāṭi or Saṁghasvāṭi or Sauḍasa (18) ; Śāṭasvāṭi or Svāṭi (18) ; Skandhasvāṭikarṇa or Skandhasatkarṇi (7) , Mrgendra (3) ; Kuṇṭala (8) ; Saumya or Puṣpasena (12) ; Śāṭa or Svāṭikarṇa (1) ; Puloma or Pulomāvi (36 or 24) ; Megha or Meghasvāṭi (38) ; Arīṣṭa (25) ; Hāla (8) ; Maṇḍalaka or Bhāṭaka or Pulaka or Tulaka (5) ; Puriṇḍrasena or Puriḥasena or Pulindhasena or Pravilla (1) ; Cakora (6 months) ; Mahendra (3 months or 3 years) ; Śiva or Śivasvāṭi (28) ; Gauṭami-puṭra (51 or 25) ; Puloman II (32 or 28) ; Śivaśrī (7) ; Śivaskanda (7) ; Yagnaśrī (19) ; Vijayaśrī (6) ; Candrasrī (3) ; Puloman III (7). See para 198 post.

2. Candraguṇṭa I or Vijayāditya (7) ; Saṁdṛaguṇṭa or Aśokāditya (51) ; Candraguṇṭa II, Vikramāditya (38 or 36) ; Kumāraguṇṭa (42) ; Skandaguṇṭa (25) ; Narasiṁha-guṇṭa (40) ; Kumāraguṇṭa II (44).

एकं सर्वत्सरं शातः शातकर्णिर्भविष्यति ।  
 पुलोमशातकर्णिश्च षट्त्रिंशद्भविता समाः ॥

अष्टत्रिंशत् समा मेघशातकर्णिर्भविष्यति ।  
 अरिष्टशातकर्णिश्च पञ्चविंशतिवत्सरान् ॥

यमेवाऽऽहु नैभिकृष्णमितिहासविचक्षणाः ।  
 ततो ह्यलो महाभागः कविकल्पामरद्रुमः ॥

शासिष्यति महीं पञ्च वर्षाणि सुमहायशाः ।  
 ततो मण्डलको राजा भविता पञ्च वै समाः ॥

पुरीन्द्रसेनो भविता समाः सोऽप्येकविंशन्निभः ।  
 सुन्दरः शातकर्णिस्तु वर्षमेकं भविष्यति ॥

चकोरशातकर्णिश्च षण्मासान् भोक्ष्यते महीम् ।  
 बाशिष्ठीपुत्रनामा यः प्रख्यातिं भुवि यास्यति ॥

महेन्द्रशातकर्णिस्तु त्रीन् मासान् भोक्ष्यते ततः ।  
 अष्टाविंशति वर्षाणि शक्यसेनो भविष्यति ।  
 यमाहुर्गुह्यदरीपुत्रं शिवस्माति महाजनाः ॥

श्रीशातकर्णिर्भविता पञ्चविंशतिवत्सरान् ।  
 गौतमीपुत्रनाम्ना तु यो वै ख्यातिं गमिष्यति ॥

पुलोमश्रीशातकर्णिर्द्वात्रिंशद्भविता समाः ।  
 बाशिष्ठीपुत्रनाम्ना तु शाः तेषु य उच्यते ॥

शिवश्रीशातकर्णिश्च तस्य भ्राता महामतिः ।  
 भविष्यति समा राजा सप्तैव हि कलौ युगे ॥

शिवस्कन्दः शातकर्णिस्तिष्ठो भावी ततः समाः ॥

यज्ञश्रीशातकर्णिश्च गौतमीपुत्रनामकः ।  
 एकोनविंशतिं राजः भविष्यति समा भुवि ॥

विजयश्रीशातकर्णिः षडेव भविता समाः ।  
 चन्द्रश्रीशातकर्णिस्तु त्रीणि वर्षाणि भोक्ष्यति ।  
 बाशिष्ठीपुत्रनाम्ना तु ख्यातो यश्च भविष्यति ॥

पुलोमाऽपि तथा चाऽन्यः समाः सप्त भविष्यति  
 षटोत्कचस्य पुत्रेण चन्द्रयुसेन पालितः ॥

एते द्वाविंशदान्नास्तु भोक्ष्यन्ति वसुधामिमाम् ।  
 शतानि पञ्च पूर्णानि तेषां राज्यं भविष्यति ॥  
 तेषां तु संस्थिते राज्ये भूमिर्गुप्तान् गमिष्यति ।  
 श्रृंगार्वतीयान्ध्रश्रृङ्गा इत्याख्यां यान्ति ये नृपाः ॥  
 अन्ध्राणामेव काले तु बहवो म्लेच्छवंशजाः ।  
 विन्धुं तीर्त्वा ऽभिय स्यन्ति भारतश्रीजिवृक्षया ॥  
 सप्तषष्टि समा भाव्या दशाऽऽभीरा महोजसः ।  
 द्विसप्तति गर्दमिनः सप्तैवाऽसुरगोनयः ॥  
 शतानि त्रीण्यशीति च शकास्त्वष्टादशैव तु ।  
 सप्तार्शीति समा क्षष्टौ भोक्तारो यवना महाम् ॥  
 शतानि त्रीणि भोक्ष्यन्ति द्रुणा श्रेकादशाऽथ वे ।  
 त्रयोदश विविष्यन्ति मरुण्डा द्वे शते समाः ॥  
 पञ्चवर्षशतानीह तुषाराख्याश्चतुर्दश ।  
 पार्थिवैर्वृषलैः सार्धं भविष्यन्ति विदेशजाः ॥  
 तैरेव साकं गुप्तानां राज्यं सर्वं विनष्टस्यति ।  
 ततः प्रभृति भूरेषा म्लेच्छक्रान्ता भविष्यति ॥

Thus, these 32 kings of the Āndhra Dynasty reigned for a total period of 506 years, although in summing up their total period of reigns, it states in round figures that they ruled for full 500 years (instead of 506 years) ; and their kingdom passed into the hands of Candragupta, son of Ghaṭōtkaca Gupta and grandson of Śrī Gupta, who appears to have come from Śrī Parvata or Nepāl and originally entered the service of Vijayaśrī Śātakarṇi as one of his generals and with whose help he managed to maintain his tottering kingdom,

45. Before proceeding to consider the merits of Purāṇic history as reviewed by orientalisists a brief statement of the cosmogonic and political calculations of time adopted in India may be useful.

“According to the Purāṇas, 360 lunar Samvatsaras, or human years constitute one divine year, Kṛita, Tretā, Dvāpara and Kali—a cycle of these four Yugas and their Sandhyās and Sandhyāmsās, consisting of 12000 divine years or 4,320,000 human years, constitutes one Mahayuga. 1000 Mahayugas constitute one Day of Brahmā or one Kalpa. An equal period of time (viz.,  $1000 \times 4,320,000 = 4,320,000,000$  human years) is also reckoned as one Night of Brahmā. 30 such days and nights make a month of Brahmā; and 12 such months his year; and 100 such years make the full period of Brahmā's life. The two halves of Brahmā's age are respectively called Pūrva-Pārārdha and Uttara-Pārārdha. The 1st or the Prathama-Pārārdha has expired; the second or the Dvitiya-Pārārdha has commenced with our present or Varāha-Kalpa. At the *beginning* of the first Pārārdha was Brāhma-Kalpa, when Brahmā or the present Kosmos was born. At the *end* of the first Pārārdha was Pādma-Kalpa, when the Lōka-Padma (the Lotus of Lōkas) appeared at the navel of Hari. The first Kalpa of the Dvitiya-Pārārdha which is the present Kalpa is called Varāha Kalpa, when Hari incarnated as Varaha or the Wonderful Boar. We are now in the 1st day of the fifty-first year of Brahmadeva, called Śveta; and each of the days of the month of Brahmā bore a different name, like (1) Śveta, (2) Nilalohita, (3) Vāmadeva, (4) Rathantara, (5) Raurava, and so on. So the present Kalpa called the “Śveta-Varāha-Kalpa” forms the 18001st Kalpa of the Brahmā, a day and night of Brahma being calculated *here* as one Kalpa.

14 Manus reign during the day of Brahmā, each Manu reigning for  $71\frac{3}{4}$  Mahayugas. Each Manvantara, therefore, consists of 857, 142 $\frac{3}{4}$  divine years or 337, 142, 657 $\frac{1}{2}$  human or lunar years. With every day and night the age of Brahmā declines. The present Manvantara is the seventh Manvantara of Varāha-Kalpa, the first six Manvantaras having already elapsed. The first six Manvantaras are known after the name of the respective Manus, as (1) Svāyambhuva, (2) Svārōchisha, (3) Autama, (4) Tāmasa, (5) Raivata and (6) Chākshusha, and the present or the seventh Manvantara is called Vaivasvata Manvantara. The present Kali Yuga is the fourth or the last quarter of the 28th Mahayuga of this Vaivasvata Manvantara, and 5018 years of this Kali Yuga have expired by the 13th day of April 1917.”

Kali-Yuga, begins from the year 3102 B.C.; the year 1, expired or completed, being 3101 B.C. The four Yugas, or Ages, which comprise one Mahāyuga, have the following periods:—

Kṛta-Yuga	...	1,728,000	360	4800 years of Gods.
Tretā-Yuga	...	1,296,000	360	3600 "
Dwāpara-Yuga	...	864,000	360	2400 "
Kali-Yuga	...	432,000	360	1200 "

---

One Mahā-Yuga... 4,320,000 360 12000 years of Gods.

The Kali Age is said to embrace Six Śakas. Thus it is said in Pancānga-Sarapī:—

अस्मिन् कलियुगे षट्शका वर्तन्ते—

युधिष्ठिरो विक्रम-शालिवाहनौ ततो नृपस्याद्विजयामिनन्दनः !

ततस्तु नागार्जुनभूपतिः कलिः कलौ युगे षट् शककालवर्षकाः ॥

एतेषां प्रमाणाः—

कमेण वेदाधिशून्यरामाः (3044)

शराभिचन्द्राः (135) खखुखाहिमूमयः (1800)

ततोऽयुतं (10000) लक्षचतुष्टयं च (400000)

शशाङ्कनेत्राष्ट (821) मिताः शकाः ॥

“In the Kali-age there are six founders of eras. First there was Yudhishtira in Indraprastha, whose era lasted for 3044 years. The second was Vikrama at Ujjayini, whose era had run for 135 years. The third was Salivahana at Pratisthana. Here the era of Yudhishtira is made the same as that of the Kaliyuga, which also dates from 3044 years before the era of Vikrama. The Yudhishtira era also is obtained by adding 3179 to the Saka year; (i.e., the Saka begins with the 3180th year of the Yudhishtira era) and “by adding 3044 to the Vikrama Samvat which, in its turn, is got by adding 135 to the Saka date.”

**46. Vikrama or Samvat Era** began in 56 B.C. “A Hindu legend tells us that a celebrated king Vikrama or Vikramaditya of Ujjain, in Malwa, began to reign in that year, and founded the era, which, in that view, runs from the commencement of his reign. Another version of it asserts that he died in that year, and that the reckoning runs from his

1. See T. V. SrinivasaIyengar, *The Present Kaliyuga*, JOR, III, 325.

2. See S. P. L. Narasimhaswami, *IA*, XL, 162 and B. B. Bhagwat, *JRAS*, XX, 150.

death. It is common to both the Digambaras and the Svetambaras. And the GATHAS or Prakrit verses, upon which the earlier portions of some of the Jain PATTAVALS or successions of the pontiffs are based, pretend to put forward such details about Vikramaditya as that "for eight years he played as a child for "sixteen he roamed over the country; for fifty-six"—(? fifteen)—"he exercised rule, being given over to false doctrine; for fifty years he was devoted to the religion of the Jina and then obtained heaven." An addition to the legend connects Vikramaditya with some foreign invaders of India who were called Sakas; and this, again, appears in two versions; one version represents him as regaining the kingdom of Ujjain after the Saka kings and dispossessed his father and had reigned there for four years prior to B.C. 57; and the other, as reported by Alberuni in the eleventh century A.D.,—brings the Sakas on the scene a hundred and thirty-five years later, and asserts that Vikramaditya marched against the Saka king, and put him to flight and killed him "in the region of Kärur, between Multan and the castle of Loni," and that in celebration of this, there was established the Saka era commencing A.D. 78. And another addition asserts that at the court of Vikramaditya there flourished "the Nine Gems," namely, the poet Kalidasa, the astronomer Varahamihira, the lexicographer Amarasimha, and the various authors Dhanvantari, Ghatakarpara, Kshapanaka, Santu, Vararuchi and Vetalaabhatta."<sup>2</sup>

**47. Salivahana-Saka**, is "the Saka or era of Śālivāhana," the Saka or era of the glorious and victorious king Śālivāhana, the year of the Saka or era established by Śālivāhana. And the popular belief, in that the Saka era was founded by a king Śālivāhana reigning in A.D. 78 at Pratishthāna, which is the present Paithan on the Gōdāvarī, in the Nizam's territory."<sup>3</sup>

1. J. F. Fleet, *IA*, XXX. 1; *JRAS*, (1916), 809.

"See Professor Keith's examination of this question in the *Int. Ant.* vol. 20 (1891), p. 404 ff. His earliest instance of the word *vikrama* being used in connection with the era, in a not quite clear sense, namely, in the expression *vikramākhya-kūla*, "the time called *vikrama*," is one of the year 698, in A.D. 842, from an inscription at Dhoolpur (p. 406, No. 10). His earliest instance of the era being plainly attributed to a king Vikrama was a literary one of the year 1050, in A.D. 993 (*Ibid.* No. 40). An earlier instance is known now from the Eklingī inscription, which is dated in the year 1028 of king Vikramaditya in A.D. 971: *JRAS*, vol. 22, p. 166."

2. J. F. Fleet, *JRAS* (1916), 809.

"The exact expression Śālivāhana-Saka is mostly confined to dates recorded in prose. In dates in verse, other ways of introducing the name Śālivāhan were follow-

Śakakāla, Sakāl ḍa or Śaka era commenced thus in 78 A.D. It is either "the Era of the Śaka king Kanishka, who conquered Kashmir and Western India in the 1st century after Christ" or the era of the defeat of the Śakas by a Hindu king.

"The astronomer, Varahamihira who lived in the sixth century A.D. cited the Saka Era as the Saka Bhupa Kala or Sakendra Kala, i.e., the Era of the Saka king. His commentator explains this as the Era when the barbarians called Sakas "were discomfited by Vikramaditva. Again, the astronomer Brahmagupta, who flourished in the seventh century A.D., cites the Era as Saka Nripante, i.e., after the Saka king. His commentator explains this as after the reign of Vikramaditya, who slew a people of Barbarians called Sakas."<sup>1</sup>

["Manu says (Ch X, 144-145) that the Sakas, Yavanas, Kambhojas, Paradas and Pahlavas were originally Kshatriyas, but became outcastes by neglecting their Vedic duties, etc. The Mahabharata (Adiparvan, Ch, 85) speaks of these tribes as descendants of Kshatriyas and as having taken part in the Great War between the Pandavas and Kauravas. The Ramayana of Valmiki (Balakanda, Sarga 55) mentions them among the tribes who fought during the war of Visvamisra with Vasishtha. The Gautama Dharma Sutra (Ch, IV, 21) speaks of the Sakas, Yavanas, etc., as a Pratiloma caste of the Aryas. It is stated in the Padma Purana (Svarga-khanda, Ch. 15) that the Sakas etc., were driven out by king Sagara, a descendant of Ikshvaku, to the countries beyond the borders of India, after getting their heads etc., shaved under the advice of Vasishtha, although they were Kshatriyas. The Vishnu Purana (Amsa II, Ch, 3) describes the Yavanas as living in the west, the Sakas in the north-west, the Kiratas in the east, and the four Indian castes in the middle of India during the time of the Great War. The Matrya Purana also refers to Sakas, Yavanas. etc., as degraded

---

ed, and the shorter form Sālīvāha was sometimes used, to suit the metre: see e.g., Professor Kielhorn's List of the Inscriptions of Southern India in *Ep. Ind.* vol. 7, appendix, Nos. 465, 475, 503, 519, 1004, 1005. This clipped form is also found occasionally in prose: see, e.g., *Ibid.*, No. 537. Compare Satavāha as the shorter form of Satavāhana."

1. Colebrooke's *Algebras*, etc., from the Sanskrit, p. xliii, London.

See on this era, Dutt's *Civ.* I. 21; Fleet, *Traditional Date of Kanishka*, *JRAS*, (1906), 286; J. H. Marshall, *Date of Kanishka*, *JRAS* (1905), 192.



Aryan tribes living on the frontiers of Bharata Varsha. Panini refers in his *Ashtadhyayi* (II. 2-84) to Sakas and Yavanas and requires शक to be placed before यव, and Panini even according to Western Orientalists lived long before the time of Alexander the Great. The Sakas, therefore, could under no circumstances, be identified with any foreign tribes that invaded India after Alexander's time."]

**48. Harsa Era** of Nepal began in 457 B.C.,<sup>1</sup> and that is the date that is referred to in *Nepālavamsāvali*.<sup>2</sup>

**Cedi or Kalacuri Era** began in 249 A.D.

**Hamsa Samvat or Era of Harsavardhana** began in 606 A.D.<sup>3</sup>

**Valabhi Era** began in 319 A.D.<sup>4</sup>

**49. Brhaspaticakra or Jovian cycle of sixty years.** "The Hindu Cycle of 60 years, technically known as the Brihaspati Chakra or Cycle of Jupiter," begins with the year Prabhava and ends with the year Kshya (60).

"In Northern India a year of the Jovian cycle is omitted once on an average of  $85 \frac{5}{22}$  years, or 22 in 1875 years; hence it has advanced on the southern system by 11 in about 950 years. The year of the cycle in Northern India is found by multiplying the Saka year by 22 adding 4291 and dividing the sum by 1875, then adding the Saka date to the integral of the quotient, and dividing by 60; the remainder is the year of the cycle. Thus, for Saka 1772 the first operation gives 23 and a remainder of 260, then  $1772 + 23$  divided by 60 gives as a remainder the 55th year of the cycle or Durmati current. If the Kali-yuga year is used, the usual rule is to multiply it by 1,0117, and to the integers of the product add 26 and divide the sum by 60 as before."

**50. Kollam** or Malabar Era began in 25th August 825 A.D. on the sun's entry into Kanyā according to the Chronogram,

आ	चा	ये	वा	ग	मे	पा
0	6	1	4	3	4	1

1. See Alberuni's *India* (Sachau's Transl. II, xlix. 7) and Bhagwanlal Indrajī's *Nepāla-Vamsāvali* in *IA*, XIII. 411-28.

2. *IA*, XLII. 207, XVII. 224, XVIII. 265.

3. *IA*, XV. 106, 188.

4. From Secapati Bhattaraka. See *Mys. Arch. Rep.* (1923), and *IA*, I. 45, IV. 104, 174, V. 904, 206, XV. 187 post. For Gupta-Valabhi Era, see *IA*, XIV. 9.

By that day 1434160 days of Kali had expired. This is current in north Malayalam, but in Travancore and Cochin, the year begins on sun's entry into Simha.

"The chief difference between the northern and southern systems is, that if the sun enters a sign of the zodiac during the day time, that day is reckoned in the northern calender as the first day of the month corresponding to that sign; whereas in the south the sun must have entered the sign within the first 3 of the 5 parts into which the day is divided, otherwise the day next is reckoned the first of the month."

"The ANDU year obtains in the Malayalam Country and in the Tinnevely District. In the former, they are known as Kollam Andu and in the latter merely as Andu. The Andu commences in the South Malayalam Country (Travancore and Cochin) and in the Tinnevely District with Chingan (Avani), i.e., on the first day of the fifth month of the Solar Calender (Tamil), and in the North-Malayalam country (British Malabar) with Kanni, i.e., on the first day of the sixth month of the same Calender. The Andu year is thus not synchronous with the Cyclic, Kali or Saka year. Andu years would appear to have been originally reckoned in Cycles of 1,000 years each, and the second of them is stated to have expired in 825 A.D. However this may be, the current Cycle, which was begun in 825 A.D., has now been carried beyond the limit of 1,000 years, and it may be that this was done in ignorance of the above convention, if any such had existed."

**51. Chronograms.** A number of devices have been adopted in Hindu Works for expressing the number of years, an expression by chronograms. They were either expressed by significant words, words which denote their own number as the equivalent or by the use of letters on an algebraical formula.

"The first complete list is that given by Alberuni (A.D. 1031); the following is from his list, as translated by Woepoke supplemented from Brown's "Cyclic Tables" and Inscriptions. As no limits can be placed to a fanciful practice like this, I cannot give this list as complete list,

Cipher.....Sunya; kha; gagana; viyat; akasa; ambara; abhra; ananta; vyoma.

1.....Adi; sasin; indu; kshiti; urvara; dhara; pitamaha; chandra; sitamsu; rupa; rasmi; prithivi; bhu; tanu; soma; nayaka; vasudha; sasanka; kshma; dharani.

2.....Yama ; Asvin ; ravichandrau ; lochana ; akshi ; Dasra ; yamala ; paksha ; netra ; bahu ; karna ; kutumba ; kara ; Jrishti.

3.....Trikala ; trijagat ; tri ; triguna ; loka ; trigata ; pavaka ; vaisvanara ; dhana ; tapana ; hutasana ; jvalana ; agni ; vahni ; trilo-  
chana ; trinetra ; Rama ; sahodara ; sikhin ; guna.

4.....Veda ; samudra ; sagara ; abdhi ; dadhi ; dis ; jalasaya ; krita ; jalanidhi ; yuga ; bandhu ; udadhi.

5.....Sara ; artha ; indriya ; sayaka ; bana ; bhuta ; ishu ; Pan-  
dava ; tata ; ratna ; prana ; suta ; putra ; visikha ; kalamba ; margana.

6.....Rasa ; anga ; ritu ; masarddha ; raga ; ari ; darsana ; tarka ;  
mata ; sastra.

7.....Aga ; naga ; parvata ; mahidhara ; adri ; muni ; rishi ; asri ;  
svara ; chhandas ; asva ; dhatu ; kalatra ; saila.

8.....Vasu ; abhi ; gaja ; dantin ; mangala ; naga ; bhuti ; ibha ;  
sarpa.

9.....Go ; nanda ; randhra ; chhidra ; pavana ; antara ; graha ;  
anka ; nidhi ; dvara.

10.....Dis ; asa ; konu ; ravanapura ; avatara ; karma.

11.....Rudra ; svara ; Mahadeva ; akshaubini ; labha.

12.....Surya ; arka ; aditya ; bhanu ; masa ; vyaya.

13.....Visva ; Manmatha ; Kamadeva.

14.....Manu ; Loka ; Indra

15.....Tithi ; pakshi ; aban.

16.....Ashti ; nripa ; bhupa ; kala.

17.....Atyashiti.

18.....Dhriti.

19.....Atidhriti.

20.....Nakha ; kriti.

21.....Utkriti ; avarga.

22.....Jati.

24.....Jina.

25.....Tattva.

Alberuni (1031 A.D.) says that numbers beyond twenty-five were noted in this way. The following, however, occur but in late documents only :

27.....Nakshatra.

32.....Danta, Rada.

33.....Deva.

40.....Tana.

The list might be made much more extensive, as it is obvious that any synonyms of any word that can be used to signify a number can be used, e.g., any word signifying 'moon' besides those mentioned as equivalent to 1, may be used for the same purpose, and so with the others. The ordinary numbered words are commonly mixed with the words given above.

In making numbers of this system units are mentioned first and then the higher orders, e.g., Rishinagakhendusamvatsara is year 1087 gaganasastrakhenduganite samvatsara is equal to 1063; dabanadri-khenduganitasamvastara is equal to 1073. It appears, however, that occasionally in recent inscriptions the words are put in the same order as the figures are written."

The algebraical formulæ are :—

- i. कादिनव ।... क (1) । ख (2) and so on to ङ (9)
- ii. टादिनव ।... ट (1) । ठ (2) and so on to ढ (9)
- iii. पादिपञ्च ।... प (1) । फ (2) and so on to म (5)
- iv. याद्यष्टौ ।... य (1) । र (2) and so on to ह (8)

The order of the letters is from right to left, in conjunct letters, the last pronounced consonant only counts value and vowels have no value. Thus विष्णु mean 54 and धर्मोन्निष्ठः means 1059.<sup>1</sup>

**52. Santracottus.** It was Sir William Jones, the Founder and President of the Society instituted in Bengal for inquiry into the History and Antiquities, the Arts, Sciences and Literature of Asia, who died on 27th April 1794, that suggested for the first time an *identification* to the notice of scholars. In his 'Tenth Anniversary Discourse' delivered by him on 28th February 1793 on "Asiatic History, Civil and Natural," referred to the so-called *discovery* by him of the identity of Candragupta, the Founder of the Maurya Dynasty of the Kings Magadha, with Sandracottus of the Greek writers of Alexander's adventures, thus :

"The Jurisprudence of the Hindus and Arabs being the field, which I have chosen for my peculiar toil, you cannot expect, that I should greatly enlarge your collection of historical knowledge; but I

---

1. See *IA*, II, 361.

may be able to offer you some occasional tribute, and I cannot help mentioning a *discovery* which accident threw in my way; though my proofs must be reserved for an essay, which I have destined for the fourth volume of your Transactions. To fix the situation of that Pālībothra, (for there may have been several of the name) which was visited and described by Megasthenes, had always appeared a very difficult problem; for, though it could not have been *Prayāga* where no ancient metropolis ever stood, nor *Cānyacubja* which has no epithet at all resembling the word used by the Greeks, nor *Gaur*, otherwise called *Lacshmanavati*, which all know to be a town comparatively modern, yet we could not confidently decide that it was *Pātaliputra*, though names and most circumstances nearly correspond, because that renowned capital extended from the confluence of the *Son* and the *Ganges* to the site of Patna, while *Pālībothra* stood at the junction of the *Ganges* and *Erranaboas*, which the accurate M. D'Anville had pronounced to be "Yamunā"; but this only difficulty was removed when I found in a Classical Sanskrit book near two thousand years old, that *Hiranyabāhu* or golden-armed, which the Greeks changed to *Erranaboas*, or the *river with a lovely murmur*, was in fact another name for the *Sona* itself, though Megasthenes from ignorance or inattention, has named them separately.<sup>1</sup> This discovery led to another of greater moment; for Chandragupta, who, from a military adventurer, became like Sandracottus, the sovereign of Upper Hindustan, actually fixed the seat of his empire at Pātaliputra, where he received ambassadors from foreign princes, and was no other than that very Sandracottus who concluded a treaty with Seleucus Nicator; so that we have solved another problem to which we before alluded; and may in round numbers consider the twelve and three hundredth years before Christ as two certain epochs between Rāma who conquered *Silān* a few centuries after the flood, and Vicramāditya who died at Ujjayini fifty-seven years before the beginning of our era."

53. The passage regarding Candragupta's date is found in Justinus, *Epitoma Pompei Trogi*, xv. 4 and Mr. McCrindle translated it as follows:<sup>2</sup>

"[Seleucus] carried on many wars in the East after the division of the Macedonian kingdom between himself and the other successor of Alexander, first seizing Babylonia, and then reducing the Bactrians, his power being increased by the first success. Thereafter he passed into

1. *Asiatic Researches*, IV. 10-11.

2. *Mendelssohn's edition* (Leipzig, 1879), I. 426.

India, which had, since Alexander's death, killed his prefects, thinking that the yoke of slavery had been shaken off from its neck. The author of its freedom had been Sandrocottus; but when victory was gained he had changed the name of freedom to that of bondage. For, after he had ascended the throne, he himself oppressed with servitude the very people which he had rescued from foreign dominion. Though of humble birth, he was impelled by innate majesty to assume royal power. When king Nandrus,<sup>1</sup> whom he had offended by his boldness, ordered him to be killed, he had resorted to speedy flight. . . . Sandrocottus, having thus gained the crown, held India at the time when Seleucus was laying the foundations of his future greatness. Seleucus came to an agreement with him, and, after settling affairs in the East, engaged in the war against Antigonus."

The same transactions are referred to by Appianus:

"[Seleucus] crossed the Indus and waged war on Androcottus king of the Indians who dwelt about it, until he made friends and entered into relations of marriage with him."

According to Strabo, Seleucus ceded to Chandragupta a tract of land to the west of the Indus and received in exchange five hundred elephants.<sup>2</sup>

The inference drawn is this: Seleucus I Nikator of Syria (b.c. 312-280), "arrived in Cappadocia in the autumn of 302 [the year preceding the battle of Ipsos]. The march from India to there must have required at least two summers. Consequently, the peace with Chandragupta has to be placed about the summer of 304, or at the latest in the next winter."<sup>3</sup> We know from various sources that Megasthenes became the ambassador of Seleucus at Chandragupta's court.<sup>4</sup>

It follows from these statements that Chandragupta ascended the throne between Alexander's death (B.C. 323) and the treaty with Seleucus (B.C. 304)."

54. Earlier in the same discourse Sir William had mentioned his authorities for the statement that Candragupta became sovereign of upper Hindusthan, with his Capital at Pataliputra. "A most beautiful

1. McCrindle's translation, 114.

2. V. A. Smith, *Early History of India*, 3rd ed., p. 150 f.; Krom, *Verms*, 41, 154 f.

3. Beloch's *Griech. Gesch.*, 3, 1 146, n. 3.

4. Schwanbeck, *Megasthenis Indica* (Bonn. 1876), p. 19; C. Muller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum*, vol. II (Paris 1848), p. 398; McCrindle, *IA*, VI. 118

poem" said he "by Somadeva, comprising a long chain of instructive and agreeable stories, begins with the famed revolution at Pataliputra by the murder of king Nanda with his eight sons, and the usurpation of Chandragupta; and the same revolution is the subject of a tragedy in Sanskrit entitled 'The Coronation of Chandra.'"<sup>1</sup> Thus he claimed to have identified *Palibothra* with *Pataliputra* and *Sandrokottus* with Chandragupta, and to have determined 300 B.C. "in round numbers" as a certain epoch between two others which he called the conquest of *Silan* by Rāma "1200 B.C." and the death of Vikramāditya at Ujjain in 57 B.C.

In the Discourse referred to, Sir William barely stated his discovery, adding "that his proofs must be reserved" for a subsequent essay, but he died before that essay could appear.

55. The theme was taken immediately by Col. Wilford in Volume V of the Asiatic Researches. Wilford entered into a long and fanciful disquisition on *Palibothra*, and rejected Sir William's identification of it with *Pataliputra*, but he accepted the identification of *Sandrokottus* with Chandragupta in the following words:—"Sir William Jones from a poem written by Somadeva and a tragedy called the Coronation of Chandra or Chandragupta discovered that he really was the Indian king mentioned by the historians of Alexander under the name of Sandrocottus. These poems I have not been able to procure; but I have found another dramatic piece entitled *Mudra-Rachasa*,<sup>2</sup> which is divided into two parts; the first may be called the Coronation of Chandra,"<sup>3</sup>

Wilson further amended the incorrect authorities relied on by Sir William Jones; and said in his Preface to *Mudra-Rakshasa*,<sup>4</sup> that by Sir William's "a beautiful poem by Somadeva" was "doubtless meant the large collection of tales by *Somabhatta* the *Vrihat-katha*."<sup>4</sup>

1. Ibid. 6.

1. This spelling shows that Wilford saw not the Sanskrit drama but some vernacular visions of it.

2. Asiatic Researches, V. 262. Wilford wrongly names the author of the drama as Amanta (or Ananta).

3. Theatre of the Hindus, Vol. II.

4. Wilson again is not quite correct in his Bibliography. Somadeva's large collection of tales is entitled *Kathasarit-sagara* and is an adaptation into Sanskrit verse of an original work in the Pataali language called *Brihat-Katha*, composed by a Guptādhyā.

56. Max Muller then elaborated the discovery of this identity in his *Ancient Sanskrit Literature*. To him this identity was a settled incontrovertible fact. On the path of further research, he examined the chronology of the Buddhists according to the Northern or the Chinese and the Southern or the Ceylonese traditions, and summed this up: "Everything in Indian Chronology depends upon the date of Chandragupta. Chandragupta was the grand-father of Asoka, and the contemporary of Selukus Nikator. Now, according to the Chinese chronology, Asoka would have lived, to waive the minor differences, 850 or 750 B.C., according to Ceylonese Chronology, 315 B.C. Either of these dates is impossible because it does not agree with the chronology of Greece." "*Everything in Indian Chronology depends upon the date of Chandragupta*" is the declaration. How is that date to be fixed? The Puranic accounts were of course beneath notice. The Buddhist chronologies were conflicting, and must be ignored. The Greek synchronism comes to his rescue. "There is but one means by which the history of India can be connected with that of Greece, and its chronology must be reduced to its proper limits," that is, by the clue afforded by "the name of Sandrocottus or Sandrocyptus, the Sanskrit Chandragupta."

From classical writers—Justin, Arrian, Diadorus Siculus, Strabo, Quintus Curtius, and Plutarch—a formidable array all of whom however borrowed their account from practically the same sources—he puts together the various statements concerning Sandrocottus, and tries to show that they all tally with the statements made by Indian writers about the Maurya king Chandragupta. "The resemblance of this name" says he "with the name of Sandrocottus or Sandrocyptus was first, I believe, pointed out by Sir William Jones. Wilford, Wilson, and Professor Lassen have afterwards added further evidence in confirmation of Sir W. Jones's conjecture; and although other scholars, and particularly M. Troyer in his edition of the *Rajatarangini*, have raised objections, we shall see that the evidence in favour of the identity of Chandragupta and Sandrocottus or Sandrocyptus is such as to admit of no reasonable doubt." Max Muller only repeats that the Greek accounts of Sandrocottus and the Indian accounts of Chandragupta agree in the main, both speaking of a usurper who either was base-born himself or else overthrew a base-born predecessor, and that this essential agreement would hold whether the various names used by Greek writers—Xandrames, Andramas, Aggraman, Sandrocottus and Sandrocyptus—should be made to refer to two kings the overthrown and the overthrower,



or all to one namely the overthrower himself; though personally he is inclined to the view that the first three variations refer to the overthrown, and the last two to the overthrower. He explains away the difficulty in identifying the sites of Palibothra and Pataliputra geographically by "a change in the bed of the river Sone." He passes over the apparent differences in detail between the Greek statements on the one hand and the Hindu and Buddhist versions on the other quite summarily, declaring that Buddhist fables were invented to exalt, and the Brahmanic fables to lower Chandragupta's descent! Lastly with respect to chronology the Brahmanic is altogether ignored, and the Buddhist is "reduced to its proper limits" that is, pulled down to fit in with Greek chronology.

**57. Priyadasi.** Next came inscriptions of Priyadāsi.<sup>1</sup> These edicts published in the tenth and twelfth years of Asoka's reign (253 and 251 B.C.) are found in distinct places in the extreme East and West of India. As revealed in these engraved records, the spoken dialect was essentially the same throughout the wide and fertile regions lying between the Vindhya and Himalayas and between the mouths of the Indus and the Ganges. The language appears in three varieties, which may be named the *Punjabi*, the *Ujjaini* and the *Magadhi*. These may point to a transitional stage between Sanskrit and Pali. "The language of the inscriptions," says Prinsep "although necessarily that of their date and probably that in which the first propagators of Buddhism expounded their doctrines, seems to have been the spoken language of the people of Upper India than a form of speech peculiar to a class of religionists or a sacred language, and its use in the edicts of Piyadasi, although incompatible with their Buddhistic origin, cannot be accepted as a conclusive proof that they originated from a peculiar form of religious belief."

Asoka's name does not occur in these inscriptions, but that these purport to emanate from a king who gives his formal title in various Prakrit forms of which the Sanskrit would be DEVANAMPRIYAH Priya-

1. The Edicts are edited in *IA*, 6, 10, 14, 17, 18, 19, 22, 24, 27, 28. On the Edicts, see *IA*, XIII, 304; XX, 1, 85, 229; XXXV, 220; XXXIV, 246; XXXVIII, 151; XLVII, 48.

Also, D. R. Bhandarkar, *Asoka*, Calcutta; V. A. Smith, *Asoka*, Oxford; F. W. Thomas, *Les Vissais de Asoka*, *JA*, (1910); E. Hultzsch, *Date of Asoka*, *JRAS*, (1914) 948. H. H. Wilson, *Identity of Asoka*, *JRAS*, (c. o.), XXII, 177, 248; (1901) 827-858; V. A. Smith, *Authorship of Piyadasi inscriptions*, *JRAS*, (1901), 485; *Asokavadana*, *JRAS*, (1901) 545, Bindusara, *JRAS*, (1901), 884.

darsi raja. It was James Prinsep that first ascribed Asoka's edicts to Devanāmpīya-Tissa of Ceylon.<sup>1</sup> The discovery of the Nagajuna Hill cave-inscriptions of Sashalata Devānāmpīya, whom he at once identified with Dasāratha, the grandson of the Maurya king Asoka and the fact that Turnour had found Piyadassi or Piyadassana used as a surname of Asoka in the Dīpavamśa, induced Prinsep to abandon his original view, and to identify Devanampriya Priyadarśan with Asoka himself.

In February 1838, Prinsep published the text and a translation of the second rock edict, Gīrnār version of it (l. 3) the words *Antiyako Ponnarīyā* and in the Dhauli version (l. 1) *Antiyoko nāma Pōna-lūyā*, and identified the Yōna king Antiyaka or Antiyoka with Antiochus III of Syria.<sup>2</sup> In March 1838, he discovered in the Gīrnār edict xiii (l. 8), the names of Turamāya, Amtikona,<sup>3</sup> and Magā, whom he most ingeniously identified with Ptolemy II Philadelphos of Egypt, Antigonus Gonatas of Macedonia (?) and Magas of Cyrene. At the same time he modified his earlier theory and now referred the name Antiyoka to Antiochus I or II of Syria, preferably the former.

On the Gīrnār rock the name of a fifth king who was mentioned after Magā is lost. The Shāhbāzgarhi version calls him Alikasundara. E. Norris recognized that this name corresponds to the Greek Ἀλεξάνδρῳ, and suggested hesitatingly that Alexander of Epirus, the son of Pyrrhus, might be meant by it.<sup>4</sup> This identification was endorsed by Westergaard,<sup>5</sup> Lassen,<sup>6</sup> and Senart.<sup>7</sup> But Professor Beloch thinks that Alexander of Corinth, the son of Craterus, had a better claim.<sup>8</sup>

"The mention of these five contemporaries in the inscriptions of Dēvānāmpriya Priyadarśhi," says E. Hultzsch, "confirms in a general

1. E. Hultzsch, *Date of Asoka*, *JRAS*, (1914), 948.

2. *JASB*, VII, 156.

3. In reality Gīrnār and Kālsī read *Antikina*, Shāhbāzgarhi *Antikini*. Buhler (*ZDMG.*, 40, 197) justly remarked that these two forms would rather correspond to Antigēnes than to Antigonus. But no king named Antigēnes is known to us, though it was the name of one of the officers of Alexander the Great, who was executed, together with Eumenes, in B.C. 316, being then satrap of Susiana.

4. *JRAS*, (o. s.), 205.

5. *Zwei Abhandlungen*, translated from the Danish into German by Etenzier (Breslau, 1869), p. 120 f.

6. *Ind. Alt.*, 253 ff.

7. *IA*, XX, 242.

8. *Griseh. Gesch.*, 3, 2, 105.

way the corrections of Prinsep's identification of the latter with Asoka, the grandson of Chandragupta, whose approximate time we know from Greek and Roman records. Antiochus I Soter of Syria reigned B.C. 280-261, his son Antiochus II Theos 261-246, Ptolemy II Philadelphos of Egypt 285-247, Antigonus Gonates of Macedonia 276-239, Magas of Cyrene c. 300—c. 250, Alexander of Epirus 272—c. 255, and Alexander of Corinth 252—c. 244."

58. This identification of Sandrocottus with Candragupta Maurya furnished a very certain starting point in investigating what appeared to be such a huge field of uncertainties as Indian Chronology. Thus, according to Buddhist traditions, it is said, Buddha died 162 years before Candragupta. Max Muller supposes that "Chandragupta became king about 315 B.C., and so he places the death of Buddha 162 plus 315 or 477 B.C. Or again 32 years after Chandragupta, Asoka is said to have become king, that is 315—32 or 283 B.C.; and his "inauguration" is said to have taken place in 259 B.C. At the time of Asoka's inauguration 218 years had elapsed since the conventional date of Buddha's death." Hence Buddha must have also died in 477 B.C.

59. Thus came in the ANCHOR SHEET OF INDIAN CHRONOLOGY. It fell to the glorious lot of Vincent E. Smith to sponsor this hypothesis and instal it on a firmer pedestal. Glory is god-made and V. S. Smith was destined for it.<sup>1</sup> He took the chronological identity so premised by the predecessors in this historical heirarchy as the basis of further calculation of the exact dates of the different dynasties that ruled over Magadha before and after the Mauryas. He was able to invoke the aid of numismatics in addition to epigraphy. He could interpret the eras, particularly the Gupta era of the inscriptions and the legends on the coins, and discover a confirmation of the earlier opinions. He could not however get over, as if by compunction, the need to follow the Purāṇas in the enumeration of the kings and their dynasties; he took the dynasties and the succession of kings as they were, he did not call them fictitious. He had objection to the long

1. The reader may well be reminded of the facelious address of Gopi to Śrī Kṛṣṇa :

उच्यार्कोऽपि महीधरो लघुतरो दोभ्या धृतो ललितया  
तेन त्वं दिमि भूतले च सततं गोवर्धनो गीयसे ।  
त्वां त्रैलोक्यधरं ब्रह्मि कुचयोरग्रे न तद्रूपयते ।  
किं वा केचन माषणेन बहूना पुण्यैर्यस्यो लभ्यते ॥

periods of years that these Purāṇas sometimes assigned to particular kings or dynasties. They were improbable and fanciful and so on their face unreliable ! So he set out to sift the intervals of time and adjust the dates and periods on a rational basis, a basis that would quite convince the modern mind of a reasonable probability. The device of reduction of time is in short this :

Where the Purāṇas have different readings the shortest number of years is adopted ; where the Purāṇas give a long period to any reign, it is reduced to 20 years as the average ascertainable in royal histories elsewhere ; where the Purāṇas give only brief terms of a few years or a few months, that is adopted as correct. The result of these reductions will be seen below :—

PURANAS.			V. SMITH.
Nandās	...	100 (1635-1535 B.C.)	45
Mauryas	...	316 (1535-1219 B.C.)	137
Sungas	...	300 (1219—919 B.C.)	112
Kaṇvas	...	85 ( 919—834 B.C.)	45
Āndhras	...	506 ( 834—328 B.C.)	289
Guptas	...	245 ( 328—83 B.C.)	149

Thus, according to Vincent Smith's Candrāguṇṭha became king in 322 B.C., and Buddha died in 487 B.C., this allows 50 years for the *Nandas*, before Candraguṇṭha, and 250 years for the *Saisunagas* before the Nandas. And so he begins his *Early History* from about 602 B.C. Likewise, starting from 322 B.C., V. Smith allows 137 years for the Maurya Dynasty and places Sunga kings in 185-73 B.C., and Kaṇva kings in 73 to 28 B.C., and so on bringing the list down to Āndhras and Guṇṭhas. I extract the passage :

“ Although the discrepant traditionary materials available do not permit the determination with accuracy of the chronology of the Saisunaga and Nanda dynasties, it is, I venture to think, possible to attain a tolerably close approximation to the truth, and to reconcile some of the traditions. The fixed point from which to reckon backwards is the year 322 B.C., the date for the succession of *Chandraguṇṭha Maurya*, which is certainly correct, with a possible error not exceeding three years. The second principal datum is the list of ten kings of the Saisunaga dynasty as given in the oldest historical entries in the Puranas, namely those in the MATSYA and the VĀYU, the general correctness of which is confirmed by several lines of evidence ; and the third is the probable date of the death of Buddha,

Although the fact that the Saisunaga dynasty consisted of ten kings may be admitted, neither the duration assigned by the Puranas to the dynasty as a whole, nor that allotted to certain reigns, can be accepted. Experience proves that in a long series an average of twenty-five years to a generation is rarely attained, and that this average is still more rarely exceeded in a series of reigns as distinguished from generations.

The English series of ten reigns from Charles II to Victoria, inclusive, 1649-1901 (reckoning the accession of Charles II from the death of his father in 1649), occupied 252 years, and included the two exceptionally long reigns of George III and Victoria, aggregating 124 years. *The resultant average, 25.2 years per reign, may be taken as the maximum possible, and consequently 252 years are the maximum allowable for the ten Saisunaga reigns.* The Puranic figures of 321 (MATSYA) and 332 (VAYU) years, obtained by adding together the durations of the several reigns may be *rejected* without hesitation as being incredible. The MATSYA account concludes with the statement, 'These will be the ten Saisunaga kings. The Saisunagas will endure 360 years, being kings with Kshatriya kinsfolk.' Mr. Pargiter suggests that the figures '360' should be interpreted as '163'. If that interpretation be accepted the average length of reign would be only 16.3, and it would be difficult to make Buddha (died cir. 487) contemporary with Bimbisara and Ajatasatru. It is more probable that the dynasty lasted for more than *two centuries*.

As stated in the text, the traditional periods assigned to the Nanda dynasty of either 100 or 150 years for two generations cannot be accepted. *A more reasonable period of fifty years may be provisionally assumed.* We thus get the 302 (252 plus 50) as the maximum admissible period for the Saisunaga and Nanda dynasties combined; and, reckoning backwards from the fixed point, 322 B.C., The Year 624 B.C., is found to be the earliest possible date for Sisunaga, the first king. But of course the true date may be, and probably is, somewhat later, because it is extremely unlikely that twelve reigns (ten Saisunaga and two Nanda) should have attained an average of 25.16 years.

The reigns of the fifth and sixth kings, Bimbisara or Srenika, and Ajatasatru or Kanika, were well remembered owing to the wars and events in religious history which marked them. We may therefore assume that the lengths of those reigns were known more or less accu-

rately, and are justified in accepting the concurrent testimony of the VAYU and MATSYA Puranas, that Bimbisara reigned for twenty-eight years.

Ajatasatru is assigned twenty-five or twenty-seven years by different Puranas, and thirty-two years by Tibetan and Ceylonese Buddhist tradition. I assume the correctness of the oldest Puranic list, that of the MATSYA, and take his reign to have been twenty-seven years. The real existence of Darsaka (erroneously called Vamsaka by the MATSYA) having been established by Bhasa's VASAVADATTA, his reign may be assigned twenty-four years, as in the MATSYA. Udaya, who is mentioned in the Buddhist books, and is said to have built Pataliputra, is assigned thirty-three years by the Puranas, which may pass.

The VAYU and MATSYA Puranas respectively assign eighty-five and eighty-three years to the sum of the reigns of kings numbers 9 and 10 together. These figures are improbably high, and it is unlikely that the two reigns actually occupied more than fifty years. *The figure 50 is assumed.*

The evidence as far as it goes, and at best it does not amount to much, indicates that the average length of the later reigns was in excess of the normal figure. We may *assume*, therefore, that the first four reigns, about which nothing is known must have been comparatively short, and did not exceed some seventy or eighty years collectively. An assumption that these reigns were longer would unduly prolong the total duration of the dynasty, the beginning of which *must be dated* about 600 B.C., or a little earlier.

The existence of a great body of detailed traditions, which are not mere mythological legends, sufficiently establishes the facts that both Mahavira, the Jain leader, and Gautama Buddha were contemporary to a considerable extent with one another and with the kings Bimbisara and Ajatasatru.

Tradition also indicates that Mahavira predeceased Buddha. The death of these saints form well-marked epochs in the history of Indian religion, and are constantly referred to by ecclesiastical writers for chronological purposes. It might therefore be expected that the traditional dates of the two events would supply at once the desired clue to the dynastic chronology. But close examination of conflicting

traditions raises difficulties. The year 527 (528-7) B.C., the most commonly quoted date for the death of Mahavira, is merely one of several traditionary dates, and it seems to be impossible to reconcile the Jain traditions either among themselves or with the known approximate date of Chandragupta."

60. This exposition of V. E. Smith has become the unalterable standard for later scholars.<sup>1</sup> Great and sincere as many of these scholars have been, they did not dare or care to go behind Smith's fiat and if any did differ from him, it was over the insignificant question of the particular year in which Chandragupta was crowned, if it was 312, 315, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326 or 327 B.C.<sup>2</sup> Thus Fleet says :-

Now, in all matters of the most ancient Indian chronology, the great "sheet anchor" is, and has been ever since 1798, the date of Chandragupta, the grandfather of Aśoka the Maurya, as determined by the information furnished by the Greek writers. In recent years, indeed, there has been a tendency to believe that we have something still more definite in the reference to certain foreign kings in the thirteenth rock-edict of Aśoka. But, as may be shown on some other occasion, there is nothing in that, beyond proof that that edict, framed not earlier than the ninth year after the *abhisheka* or anointment of Aśoka to the sovereignty, and most probably in the thirteenth year, was framed not before B.C. 272; and that does not help as much, because the *abhisheka* of Aśoka might, so far as that goes, be put back to even as early a year as B.C. 284. In all that we have as yet been able to determine about Aśoka, there is nothing that enables us to improve upon what we could already determine about Chandragupta. From the Greek writers, we know that Chandragupta became king of Northern India at some time between B.C. 326 and 312. Within those limits, different writers, have selected different years; B.C. 325, 321, 316, 315 and 312. The latest selection is, I suppose, that made by Mr. Vincent Smith in his *Early History of India*, 173; namely, B.C. 321."<sup>3</sup>

---

1. V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar, *Matsyapurana*, Madras; R. D. Banerjee, *Age of Imperial Guptas*, Benares; Dhruvasandra Sircar, *Successors of Śālavāhanas, II. of Dept. of Letters*, Calcutta, Vol. 26; Dhirendranath Mukhopadhyaya, *True Dates of Buddha and Connected Epochs*, Ibid. Vol. 27.

2. See M. Benart, *IA*, XX, 229; S. Gopala Iyer, *IA*, XXXVII, 341; Buhler, *IA*, VI, 119, *EL*, III, 134; Fleet, *JRAS*, (1904) 1, (1906) 983; V. Smith, *EHJ*, 173.

3. Fleet, *JRAS*, (1906) 984.

61. The deductions and inferences of V. Smith have come to stay. But the traditional reputation has been too staring in its assertion that Mahābhārata War happened at the end of Dvāparayuga, 37 years before the advent of Kaliyuga in 3102 B.C. Later scholars, to whom the tradition was a fraud resorted to the only alternative viz., to post-date the beginning of Kaliyuga so as to preserve the Purāṇic Synchronism of Mahābhārata War with about the end of Dvāparayuga. Even there the sayings of V. Smith were adopted as canons of indubitable truth and the dates were worked up on their basis only and this had been done in wholesale disregard of the care and precision with which the Purāṇas recorded the calculations of political history.

62. The Purāṇas uniformly give two methods, which are corroborative of each other, in calculating the dates of these Hindu Dynasties. One starts from the close of the Mahābhārata War and almost co-evaally with the commencement of the Kaliyuga, from which time the number of years that each king reigned is given. The other starts from the Saptarṣi Era or the Laukikābda, whose cycle consisting of 2700 years is accepted by all authorities to have commenced about 4992 years ago corresponding to 3676 B.C. Now the Purāṇas state the First cycle of this Saptarṣi Era or Laukikābda commenced at the time of Parikṣit, that the Saptarṣis were in Māgha at his time, that they move in a retro-grade motion and take 100 years to pass from one Nakṣatra to another, that they were in Purvāṣāḍha (or the 16th Nakṣatra from Māgha) at the time of the commencement of the Nanda dynasty, that they were in Citrā-Nakṣatra (or the 24 Nakṣatra from Māgha) at the commencement of the Āṇḍhra Dynasty and that at the beginning of the reign of the 27th king of the Āṇḍhra Dynasty, the cycle repeated itself, the Saptarṣis having come back to Māgha. So there must have elapsed at least 1500 years between Parikṣit and Mahāpadma Nanda, 2300 years between Parikṣit and Āṇḍhra Simuka (Śrī Śātakarṣi) the Founder of the Āṇḍhra Dynasty and 270 years between Parikṣit and Śivaśrī Śātakarṣi, the 27th king of the Āṇḍhra Dynasty, and that this king Śivaśrī must have commenced his reign in the year 377 B.C.

63. The Mahābhārata War starts the Purāṇic chrōnology, that is, at 3139 B.C. The periods assigned to the eight dynasties that ruled over Magadha, Bārhaḍraṭha to Āṇḍhra is made up 2811 years thus:—



Dynasty	No. of Kings	years.
1. Bārhadraṭṭha (post-Bhāraṭa)	22	1006
2. Praḍyōṭa	5	138
3. Śaiśunāga	10	360
4. Nanda	9 (2 generations)	100
5. Maurya	12	316
6. Sunga	10	300
7. Kaṇva	4	85
8. Andhra	32	506
Total <sup>1</sup> ...		2811

2811 years after the Mahābhārata War or about 328 B.C., the sovereignty of Magadha passed into the hands of a line called *Pārva-tiyū* and *Anḍhrabhṛtja*, the first king of which was Candragupta.

64. This Saptarṣi Era is fully described in all the Purāṇas in words almost similar to one another and the following passage from the Kaliyuga-Rāja-Vṛttānta may suffice as an example :—

सप्तर्षिस्तुतिपर्यन्ते कृत्स्ने नक्षत्रमण्डले ।  
 सप्तर्षयस्तु तिष्ठन्ति पर्यायेण शते शतम् ॥  
 सप्तर्षिणां युगं वेतद् दिव्यया संख्यया स्मृतम् ।  
 सप्त दिव्याः स्मृताः सप्त दिव्या मासाः षडेव हि ॥  
 ऋक्षादृक्षं शतेनाऽर्द्धैर्यान्ति चित्रशिखण्डिनः ।  
 दिव्यः सप्तर्षिकालोऽयं क्रमादेवं प्रवर्तते ॥  
 सप्तर्षिणां तु यौ पूर्वौ दृश्येते श्रद्धितौ दिवि ।  
 तयोस्तु मध्ये नक्षत्रं दृश्येते यत् समं निशि ॥  
 तेन सप्तर्षयो युक्तास्तिष्ठन्त्यब्दशतं नृणाम् ।  
 नक्षत्राणामृषीणाञ्च योगस्यैतन्निर्देशनम् ॥  
 यदा देवर्षयः सप्त मघासु विचरन्ति हि ।  
 तदा प्रवृत्तश्च कलिर्द्वादशाब्दशतात्मकः ॥

1. As summed up in Kaliyuga-Rājavṛttānta or 2886 according to Matsya ?

Vincent Smith commits an egregious blunder in making the first 10 or 11 kings of the Andhra dynasty contemporaneous with the preceding dynasties and holding that the slayer of the last Kaṇva king " apparently must have been one or other of three Andhra kings namely No. 11, 12 or 13 " *Early History* p. 206.

यस्मिन् कृष्णो दिवं यातस्तस्मिन्नेव हि वत्सरे ।  
 प्रतिपन्नं कलियुगमिति प्राहुः पुराविदः ॥  
 यावत् स भगवान् विष्णुः पस्पर्शमां वसुन्धराम् ।  
 तावत् पृथ्वीं पराक्रांतुं समर्थो नाऽभवत् कलिः ॥  
 यदा मघाभ्यो यास्यन्ति पूर्वाषाढा महर्षयः ।  
 ततः प्रभृत्येव कलिवृद्धिं यास्यति मिथितम् ॥  
 यदा युधिष्ठिरो राजा शक्रप्रस्ये प्रतिष्ठितः ।  
 तदा सप्तर्षयः प्रापुर्मघाः पितृहिते रताः ॥  
 पञ्चसप्ततिवर्षाणि प्राक् कलेः सप्त ते द्विजाः ।  
 मघास्त्रासन् महाराजे शासत्युर्वी युधिष्ठिरे ॥  
 पञ्चावेंशतिवर्षेषु गतेष्वथ कलौ युगे ।  
 समाश्रयिष्यन्त्याश्रेषां मुनयस्ते शतं समाः ॥  
 तदैव धर्मपुत्रोऽपि महाप्रस्थानमास्थितः ।  
 भुवं परिभ्रमन्नन्ते स्वर्गमारोक्ष्यति ध्रुवम् ॥  
 तदैव लौकिकाब्दोऽपि सप्तार्धशतात्मकः ।  
 धर्मपुत्रज्ञापकार्थं लोके तावत् प्रवर्तितः ॥  
 सप्तविंशान्ध्रनृपतेः काले भाव्यस्य ते पुनः ।  
 आश्रेषां सम्प्रयास्यन्ति युगस्यान्ते सूरर्षयः ॥  
 सप्तर्षयो मघायुक्ताः काले योधिष्ठिरे शतम् ।  
 श्रवणे ते भविष्यन्ति काले नन्त्यस्य भृपतेः ॥  
 चतुर्विंशेऽथ नक्षत्रं भविष्यति शतं समाः ।  
 आन्ध्रराज्यारम्भकालादारभ्यैते सूरर्षयः ॥  
 महापद्माभिषेकात्तु यावज्जन्म परीक्षितः ।  
 एवमेव सहस्रं तु ज्ञेयं पञ्चशतोत्तरम् ॥  
 आन्ध्रराज्योपक्रमात्तु यावन्नन्दाभिषेचनम् ।  
 अन्तरं तच्छतान्यष्टौ प्रमाणज्ञैः समाः स्मृताः ॥  
 यदा पुनर्वसुं यास्यन्त्येते सप्तर्षयः पुनः ।  
 तदा श्रीगुप्तवंश्यानां राष्ट्रं दैन्यं गमिष्यति ॥  
 पूर्वाभाद्रं यदा ते तु प्रवेक्ष्यन्ति पुनर्द्विजाः ।  
 शुक्लेभ्यो मानवं राज्यं तदा पालात् गमिष्यति ॥

The above passage may be freely translated as follows :

' In the circle of the lunar asterisms (Nakshatras) wherein the great constellation of the Sapta Rishis (constituting the Great Bear or the Ursa Major) revolve, and which contain 27 asterisms (like Āśvini, Bharani, Krittika, etc.) in its circumference (ecliptic consisting of 360°, each Nakshatra or lunar asterism being equal to 13° 20' of the ecliptic), the Seven Sages remain for 100 years in each asterism in turn (the Rishis taking 2700 years to make a circuit of the heavens).

This is the Cycle of the Seven Seers (consisting of 2700 human years) and is reckoned in the terms of Divine years (360 human years being equal to 1 Divine year). And the total period is equal to 7 Divine years and 6 Divine months (i.e.,  $7\frac{1}{2}$  times 360 or 2700 human years).

The constellation of the Seven Saints (or the Seven Stars of the Wain, consisting of Marichi, Vasishtha accompanied by the Sukshmatārā Arundhati, Angiras, Atri, Pulastya, Pulaha and Kratu) takes a period of 100 years to go over each of the 27 asterisms, (and it goes through these 27 asterisms in a retrograde order, as the Twelve Signs of the Zodiac which comprise these 27 asterisms are arranged in a retrograde order around the ecliptic). Thus the Saptarshi-Kala (or the Samvat of the Haft Rikheshar), consisting of a cycle of 2700 years, has come to be constituted.

The two front stars (Pulaha and Kratu) of the great constellation of the Seven Sages which are seen (in the northern region) when risen at night, the lunar asterism or Nakshatra which is seen situated equally between them in the sky is said to govern the same—the constellation of the Sapta Rishis being known as conjoined with that asterism for 100 human years. This is the exposition of the conjunction of the lunar asterisms and the constellation of the Sapta Rishis :

When the constellation of the Seven Sages remained conjoined with the asterism of Maghas, then the Kali Age (the sinful Kaliyuga) comprising 1200 Divine years (or 432,000 common human years) began.

When Lord Kṛishṇa returned to Heaven (i.e., left this mundane world), then in that very same year (on the first day of Chaitra of the year Pramathin according to the Southern school of Astronomers),—say the knowers of the ancient history,—the present Kaliyuga (of the 28th Mahayuga comprising 12,000 Divine years) commenced

As long as the Great Incarnation of the Divine Vishṇu continued to touch the Earth (with His holy feet), so long the Kali Age was unable to approach the Earth.

When the Seven Rishis shall pass from the Maghas and reach the asterism of Purvāṣāḍhā, then will, indeed, the Kali Age begin to grow.

When Prince Yudhisṭhira was for the first time crowned as king at Indraprastha (and established himself with his brothers, as master of half of the kingdom belonging to his father Paṇḍu), then the Seven Rishis of the constellation of the Ursa Major entered the lunar asterism of Maghas which were sacred and propitious to the Pitṛis.

The Seven Rishis (of the Great Bear) entered the asterism of the Maghas, just 75 years before the beginning of the Kaliyuga (in the year 3177 B.C.) at the commencement of the reign of the great king Yudhisṭhira who ruled the Earth during the said period.

These Seven Sages will enter the asterism of Āśleṣha on the expiry of 25 years from the commencement of the Kali Age (in the year 3077 B.C.) and they will continue to remain in that asterism for a period of 100 human years (from 3077 B.C. to 2977 C.)

In that very same year (3077 B.C.) will Dharmaputra (Yudhishtira, the eldest of the five Paṇḍava brothers) ascend to Heaven (Svargarohana) after wandering over the earth for a long time (having abdicated the throne in favour of Parikshit, the grandson of his brother Arjuna and started on his Mahaprasthana with his brothers and wife on hearing the sad and sudden news of the departure of Śrī Kṛishṇa from the world).

Then will the Laukikakāla or the Laukika Era consisting of a cycle of 2700 years be started in the world in commemoration of the Ascension of Dharmaputra into Heaven.

These Divine Sages (consisting the constellation of the Ursa Major) will reach (the lunar asterism) Āśleṣha a second time (in their revolution) at the time of the commencement of the reign of the 27th King of the Andhra Dynasty (Śivaśrī Śatakarni who began to rule Magadha in the year 2762 A. Y. corresponding to 377 B.C.—one complete cycle of 2700 years having elapsed since the expiry of the 25th year of the Kali-Yuga, when they first reached Āśleṣha after the Mahabharata War).

These Seven Sages were conjoined with the asterism Magha for a period of 100 years during the time of Yudhishtira : and at the time of the commencement of the reign of King Nanda (Mahapadma), they will be conjoined with the asterism (Śravaṇa (the 15th Nakshatra from Magha calculated, of course, in a reverse order).

From the commencement of the Andhra Dynasty (at Magadha) the Seven Rishis (of the Great Bear) will be found conjoined with (Chitra) the 24th lunar asterism (calculated from and inclusive of Magha).

The interval of time between the birth of Parikshit (son of Abhimanyu by Uttara, and grandson of Arjuna, who was in the womb of his mother at the time of the Mahabharata War) and the inauguration of Mahapadma Nanda (the Founder of the Nanda Dynasty) is to be known as 1500 years.

According to competent authorities (Pramāṇajñas) the interval of time between the coronation of Mahapadma Nanda (who came to the throne of Magadha in 1504 A. Y.) and the commencement of the Andhra Dynasty (which began to rule Magadha in 1305 A. Y.) is stated to be full 800 years.

When the great constellation of the Seven sages of the Ursa Major shall again reach the asterism Punarvasu (in its second revolution after the Mahabharata War), the Empire of the great Gupta Kings shall begin to decline : and when they shall actually enter the asterism of Purvabhadra thereafter, the kingdom of Magadha will pass from the Guptas to the Pala kings.

65. According to Vīrya and Maṭsya Purāṇas the interval between the birth of Parikshit and coronation of Mahapadma Nanda, is 1500 years :

महापद्मामिवेकारतु जन्म यावत् परीक्षितः ।-

एकं वर्षसहस्रम् तु क्षेमं पञ्चदशोत्तरम् ॥

But some versions of Bhāgavaṭa Purāṇa differ and state that interval to be 1115 years. The text reads :

आरभ्य मक्षतो जन्म यावन्नन्दामिवेचनम् ।

एतद्वर्षसहस्रं तु क्षेमं पञ्चदशोत्तरम् ॥

—Skanda XII. Ch. II. v. 26.

This will mean "From your birth (Parīkṣit is addressed by Śuka) to the inauguration of Nanda 1115 years will elapse." Yet according to the duration of the different intermediate dynasties as enumerated by it in Skāṇḍa XII, Chapter I, the interval comes to 1498 years viz.,

Bārhaḍrāṭha kings	1000 years
Pradyōta kings	138 "
Śaiśunāga kings	360 "

Total 1498 years

This mistake has struck the celebrated commentators, Śrīdharaśvāmin and Virarāghava and they distinctly suggest that the reading should be—

“एतद्वर्षसहस्रं तु ज्ञेयं पञ्चशतोत्तरम्”

For Śrīdhara in commenting upon this verse states :

‘आरभ्येत्यादिना—वर्षसहस्रं पञ्चदशोत्तरं शतं चेति कयाऽपि विवक्षया अवान्तर संख्येयम् । वस्तुतस्तु परीक्षितन्दयोरन्तरं द्वाभ्यां तूने वर्षाणां सार्धसहस्रं भवति । यतः परीक्षितसमकालं मागधं मार्जारिमारभ्य रिपुञ्जयान्ता विंशतिराजानः सहस्रसंवत्सरं भोक्ष्यन्तीत्युक्तं नवमस्कन्धे—

“ये बार्हद्वथम्पालाः भाव्याः साहस्रवत्सरम् ।”—इति । ततः परं पञ्च प्रयोतना अष्टविंशोत्तरं शतम्’ शिशुनागाश्च ‘षष्टयुत्तरशतत्रयं भोक्ष्यन्ति पृथिवीम् इति अत्रैवोक्तत्वात् ॥’

Thus we have the authority of Śrīdharaśvāmin and Virarāghava to say that 1500 years is the interval between Parīkṣit and Nanda.

66. But having adopted the wrong readings and reduced the period of interval between the birth of Parīkṣit and the coronation of Nanda to 1015, 1050 or 1115 years, these Orientalists bring down the date of the commencement of the Kali Yuga itself as low as possible. Assuming the wrong synchronism between Sandracottus of the Greeks and Candragupta Maurya, they place the accession of Candragupta Maurya to the throne of Magadha in 322 B.C.; and calculating backwards and forwards from that date (while accepting the Lists of Kings given in the Purāṇas and the regnal periods given of those kings as correct) fix the date of the accession of Nanda to the throne in 422 B.C., just placing him 100 years before the accession of Candragupta to the throne, and conclude that Kali Yuga must have commenced 1015, 1050 or 1115 years before that date; that is in 1437 B.C. or 1537 B.C.

conceding for all practical purposes the commencement of the Kali Yuga to be synchronous with the Birth of Parikṣit, the Coronation of Yudhisṭhira and the Great War of the Mahābhārata. This false synchronism between Sandracottus of the Greeks and Candragupta Maurya of the Indians has become so much rooted in the bed of Indian Chronology, that scholars Śriśa Chandra Vidyārnava and F. E. Pargiter placed the commencement of Kaliyuga in 1733 B.C.

"The method of calculation", says Śriśa Chandra "adopted by the Purāṇas, however, is to take Nanda as the starting point. The last of the Śiśunāga was Mahānandin, who had a son by a Sūdrā woman. He was known as Mahāpadma or the famous Nanda, whose eight sons succeeded him. This Nanda family was brought to an end by the Indian Machiavelli, Kautilya or Chāṇakya. Chandragupta was placed on the throne of the Nandas by this Kautilya or Chāṇakya. About this event V. Smith sa, s :—

'Mahānandin, the last of the Dynasty, is said to have had, by a Sūdrā or low caste woman, a son, named Mahāpadma Nanda who usurped the throne, and so established the Nanda family or dynasty. This event may be dated in or about 372 B.C. \* \* \*

The Greek or Roman historians \* \* \* ranking as contemporary witnesses throw a light on real history. When Alexander was stopped in his advance at the Hyphasis, in 326 B.C., he was informed : \* \* \* that the king of the Prachei etc, \* \* \* was Xandrames or Agramis.'

The reference to this king is evidently to one of the Nandas. The date of the accession of Nanda is calculated from that of Chandragupta Maurya, who ascended the throne in 322 B.C. The Nanda Dynasty according to Mr. Vincent Smith, lasted for 50 years, when it was replaced by the Maurya. So adding 50 to 322, the above figure 372 B.C., is arrived at by Mr. V Smith as the date of the accession of Mahāpadma Nanda. But all the Purāṇas are unanimous in stating that the nine Nandas reigned for 100 years, and we have taken that in our calculations. The date of accession of Mahāpadma Nanda would, therefore, be 422 B.C. instead of 372 B.C.

*Thus 422 B.C. is the starting point backwards and forwards in the Purāṇic calculations.*

Chandragupta Maurya displaced the Nanda family. The nine Nandas reigned for 100 years. Before that, there was the Śiśunaga Dynasty, and before that was the Pradyōta Dynasty, and before that

the Brihadrathas. The following table shows the periods of the reigns of these dynasties :—

(1) Chandragupta's accession	322 B.C.
(2) Nanda Dynasty	100
(3) Śiśunāgas	360
(4) Pradyōtas	152 (?)
(5) Bārhadhrathas from the time of Chaidyōparichara	1000
Total	1612
Deduct from Chaidya to Sahadēva	171
Balance	1441, and
adding	322
	1763 B.C., the year of the Great War.

The Mahābhārata War took place when Sahadēva of Bārhadhratha family, was king. From Vasu Chaidya Uparichara up to Sahadēva there were 13 kings, namely, (1) Vasu Chaidya Uparichara, (2) Bārhadhratha, (3) Kuśāgra, (4) Vṛishabha, (5) Puṇyavan or Pushpavan, (6) Puṇya or Pushya, (7) Satyadhṛiti, (8) Dhanusha, (9) Sarva, (10) Sambhava, (11) Brihadratha, (12) Jarāsandha, and (13) Sahadēva. After Sahadēva there were 19 or 32 kings (or 22 according to Mr. Pargiter) up to Ripunjaya the last. The Great War, therefore, took place, on the above assumption, *one thousand four hundred and forty one years before the accession of Chandragupta in 322 B.C., or in other words that the Great War took place in or about 1763 B.C.*"

67. Mr. Pargiter, however, in his *Dynasties of the Kali Age* arrives at the year 1810 B.C. as the date of the Great War of Mahābhārata. He says that from Sōmāḍhi to Ripunjaya there were 22 kings in the Bārhadhratha Dynasty who reigned for 920 years. The Pradyōtas after Ripunjaya were 5 kings who reigned for 138 years. The Śiśunāgas who came after the Pradyōtas were 10 kings and reigned for 330 years. Adding up the above mentioned three figures, 920 plus 138 plus 330, he gets the sum 1388 years, which according to his calculation, was the interval between the installation of Mahāpadma Nanda and the birth of Parīkṣit or the Great War. Adding 422 B.C., the year of the installation of Mahāpadma Nanda (which is of course assumed as a

postulate of Indian History). Mr. Pargiter comes to the figure 1810 B.C. as the date of the Mahābhārata War.

The fanciful speculations involved in these theories regarding the date of the Mahābhārata War will be manifest to any disinterested reader of the Purāṇas and Itihāsas. The conclusions were so uncertain that Śrīśa Chandra Vidyārṇava reviewed his own original theory at a later stage and refixed the date of the Great War in 1922 B.C. (still following, the false synchronism between Candragupṭa Maurya and Sandracottus).

68. Thus, we see that Vincent Smith is the modern protagonist of this identity, the *Anchor-Sheet of Indian Chronology*. It is he that is quoted and followed without inquiry by our Indian Professors of history and it is that chronology that is and *must be* taught in our schools. By sheer repetition by men in authority and in the works that emanate from them, 'the theory had almost become an axiom and rarely does any thought occur for any fair investigation. Day after day the assumed identity takes a firmer root and it is considered a matter of sensility or superstition to express a need for a reconsideration. Hasty generalisations lead to prepossessions and it is rarely human to attempt to demonstrate their reality. It may appear therefore, a futile cry to seek to go behind these established opinions and to ask the reader to forbear and see for himself on the original bases of this theory, if, after all, the narratives of the Purāṇas, so honestly planned, are 'plous frauds.' For the vindication of the morality of our sages and the merit of our traditional lore, a lore adored by the millions of Hindu India, an attempt must be made, be the effect what it may.<sup>1</sup>

69. Max Muller himself was not slow to condemn in others this tendency to generalise. Says he: "Men who possessed the true faculty of an historian-like Niebuhr, have abstained from passing sentence on the history of a nation whose literature had only just been recovered, and had not yet passed through the ordeal of philological criticism..... Other historians however thought they could do what Niebuhr had left undone; and after perusing some poems of Kalidasa, some fables of Hitopadesa, some verses of the Ananda-lahari, or the mystic poetry of

1. See also B. K. Mookerji, *Later Gupta History and Chronology*, JI. of Ind. History, IV, 17; Dineschandra Sircar, *Dynastic History of Northern India*; Jyotirmoy Sen, *Riddle of Pradyota Dynasty*, IHQ, (1930), 678; H. D. Bhide, *Pradyota Dynasty*, JBORS, (1921); K. P. Jaysawal, *Chandragupṭa II and his predecessors*, JBRS, XVIII, 17.



the Bhagavad-gita, they gave with the aid of Megasthenes and Appollonius of Tyana a so-called historical account of the Indian nation without being aware that they were using as contemporary witnesses authors as distant as Dante and Virgil. No nation has in this respect been more unjustly treated than the Indian. Not only have general conclusions been drawn from the most scanty materials but the most questionable and spurious authorities have been employed without the least historical investigation." H. H. Wilson, earlier, in the preface to his translation of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, had remarked "Impatience to generalise has availed itself of whatever promised to afford materials for generalisation, and the most erroneous views have often been confidently advocated because the guides to which their authors trusted were ignorant or inefficient."

70. The various accounts given of Candragupta and Aśoka by Hindu and Buddhist writers, have contributed to a large extent to the manipulation of Indian chronology at the historian's pleasure. In his play Muḍrārākṣasa Viśākhaḍaṭṭa who wrote about 5th century A.D. dramatises the events relating to Candragupta and his account is mostly in agreement with the Purāṇic tale. He calls Candragupta a Maurya and does not describe his parentage.

The object of the play, says Wilson, "is to reconcile Rākshasa, the hostile minister of Nanda, the late king of Palibothra (Pāṭalīputra), to the individuals by whom, or on whose behalf, his sovereign was murdered,—the Brāhman Chāpakya and the Prince Chandragupta. With this view, he is rendered by the contrivances of Chāpakya, an object of suspicion to the Prince with whom he has taken refuge, and is consequently dismissed by him. In this deserted condition, he learns the imminent danger of a dear friend, whom Chāpakya is about to put to death; and in order to effect his liberation, surrenders himself to his enemies. They offer him, contrary to his expectations, the rank and power of prime minister; and the parties are finally friends."

71. The Buddhistic accounts such as Mahāvamśa and Dipavamśa give a description of the first three kings only of the Dynasty. The accounts given of Candragupta's origin and parentage are various and contradictory. By one account it is said that Murā, the mother of Candragupta, was the servant girl of Dhana Nanda, the last of the Nanda Dynasty, and by her influence she had her son placed on the throne of Magadha at Pāṭalīputra. Another account makes him a member of an Āṇḍhra family, and says that he acquired the sovereign power by his

own skill and exertion. The writer evidently confuses here the accounts of the two Candraguṭṭas, Candraguṭṭa of the Maurya Dynasty with Candraguṭṭa the Founder of the Guṭṭa Dynasty, and an illegitimate son of the Āṇḍhra family, for the Āṇḍhra family itself came into existence about 700 years after the accession of Candraguṭṭa Maurya.

According to Northern Buddhistic accounts Candraguṭṭa was a member of the Śākya family which in consequence of some political intrigues was driven away from its territory. The family repaired to a forest in the Himavanta and there constructed a new town in a delightful and beautiful locality. The streets and houses in the town having been laid after the pattern of a peacock's neck, it was called by the name of Mōriya-nagara, and the family by the name of *Moriya*, and the kingdom founded by it Mōriya Dynasty. The explanation is ingenious and is probably based upon a confusion of the Prākṛit forms of the words Maurya (मौर्य) and Mayūra (मयूर).

The Tika on this Buddhistic account gives a curious origin of the name of this prince Candraguṭṭa. It is stated that while Candraguṭṭa was still in the womb, his father's dominions were taken possession of by another powerful neighbouring chief, and his father himself was killed in the contest. "His mother, the queen consort of the monarch of the Mōriya-nagara (मयूरनगर), the city before mentioned, was fully pregnant at the time when that powerful provincial Rāja conquered that kingdom, and put the Mōriyan king to death. In her anxiety to preserve the child in her womb, she departed for the capital of Pupphapura (Pushpapura) under the protection of her elder brothers, and under disguise she dwelt there. At the completion of the ordinary term of pregnancy, she gave birth to a son, and relinquishing him to the protection of the *dēvos*, she placed him in a vase, and deposited him at the door of a cattle-pen. A bull named Chando (चन्द्र) stationed himself by him, to protect him. A herdsman, on observing this prince, moved by affection, like that borne to his own child, took charge of and tenderly reared him; and in giving him a name, in reference to his having been watched by the bull Chando, he called him 'Chandagutṭa' (चन्द्रगुप्त), and brought him up."

But all the Buddhistic works are agreed on one point that Candraguṭṭa owed his sovereignty entirely to Cāṇakya alias Kautilya; and not 'called to royalty by the power of the gods and by prodigies' as stated by Justin with reference to his Sandracottus. Nor is there any reference either in the Hindu or the Buddhistic accounts to

Candragupta Maurya's "having traversed India with an army of 600,000 men and conquered the whole" as stated by Plutarch.

72. The Buddhistic accounts of Aśōka, as given by the two great schools of Buddhism—*Mahāyāna* and *Hīnayāna*—not only differ from each other but also from the accounts given of Aśōka, the grandson of Candragupta Maurya by the Purāṇic accounts of the Hindus. "There is a good deal of confusion in these Buddhistic works as regards the very family and geneology of Aśōka, the Buddhistic king; and one can easily trace that the life and time of Aśōka must have been constructed by the Buddhistic writers who flourished several hundreds of years after him, by jumbling up the lives of three different Indian kings, viz., (1) of Aśōka, (Dharmaśōka) the third in ascent from Kanishka belonging to the First Gōnanda Dynasty of Kāśmīr kings as described in the First Book of Kalhaṇa's *Rāja-Taraṅgiṇī* who is said to have freed himself from sins by embracing the faith of Gautama Buddha and by constructing numerous *Vihāras* and *Stūpas*, and by building the town of *Śrinagarī* with its ninety-six lakhs of houses resplendent with wealth; (2) of Aśōkavardhana (Chandāśōka) the grandson of Chandragupta Maurya, as described in the *Purāṇas*; and (3) of Samudragupta or Aśōka the Great, (Mahāśōka) the son of Chandragupta the Founder of the Gupta Dynasty, described by Mr. Vincent A. Smith himself as the Indian Napoleon, as narrated by his biographer Harishēṇa, and in the *Kaliyuga Rāja Vṛttānta*, and as corroborated by his numerous coins and inscriptions recently unearthed by European scholars themselves."

The *Mahāvamśa*, (according Wijesinha's revised edition of Tournour translation) says: "One Kālāśōka had ten sons, who after his death ruled the kingdom righteously for 22 years. They were succeeded by other nine brothers, who likewise, in order of seniority, ruled the kingdom for 22 years. A Brahman named Chāṇakya, who had conceived an implacable hatred against Dhana Nanda, the last survivor of the nine brothers, put that king to death, and placed upon the throne Chandragupta, a member of the princely Mōriya clan descended from the line of the Śākya, who ruled the country for 34 years. He was succeeded by his son Bindusāra, who ruled the land for 28 years. The sons of Bindusāra, the offspring of sixteen mothers, numbered one hundred and one, of whom the eldest was named Sumana, and the youngest Tishya. A third son, Aśōka, uterine brother of Tishya, had been appointed Viceroy of Ujjain by his father. On receiving news of King Bindusāra's mortal illness, Aśōka hastened to Pāṭalipūtra, slew his

eldest brother Sumana and his 98 other brothers and ruled the country for 37 years."

The *Dīpavaṃśa*, on the other hand, substitutes Śuśunāga for Kā-asōka and makes Aśōka, the son of Śuśunāga himself, and omits all mention of the nine Nanda brothers.

The *Aśōkavadāna* (according to the prose version in the *Dīvyāvadāna*) gives the following account of the lineage and family of Aśōka :—

"(1) King Bimbisāra reigned at Rājagṛīha. His son was (2) Ajātaśatru, whose son was (3) Udayibhadra, whose son was (4) Muṇḍa, whose son was (5) Kākavarṇin, whose son was (6) Sahālin, whose son was (7) Tulakuchi, whose son was (8) Mahāmaṇḍala, whose son was (9) Prasēnajit, whose son was (10) Nanda, whose son was (11) Bindusāra. King Bindusāra reigned at Pāṭalīputra and had a son named Susīma. To him was born of Subhadrāṅgī, the daughter of a Brāhman, two sons, the elder named Aśōka, and the younger named Vigatāśoka. Aśoka secured the throne by putting to death the legitimate prince Susīma by a stratagem devised by Rādhāgupta by which Susīma was inveigled while marching against the capital, so that he fell into a ditch full of burning fuel and there miserably perished."

Here it will be observed that Candraguṭṭa is altogether omitted, and Bindusāra, the father of Aśōka, is represented as being the son of Nanda. The metrical *Aśōkavadāna*, on the other hand, substitutes Mahīpala for Ajātaśatru, and exhibits numerous other variations, which deprive these Buddhistic accounts of historical worth. The conquests ascribed to Aśōka in the various Buddhistic accounts are no doubt taken from the conquests of Samudraguṭṭa or Aśōka the Great, and the embassy of the Ceylon king is also traceable to the same origin. The story of his having embraced the faith of Buḍḍha, of his having built stūpas and Vihāras, of his having reconstructed the city of Pāṭalīputra and of his having introduced several reforms in the affairs of the kingdom and in the matter of the appointment of officers of state are all taken from the accounts of Aśōka and his successors as given by Chhavillākara and by Kaihaṇa in his *Rājatarangīnī*.

73. Inferences have been drawn in support of this imaginary synchronism by the dates assigned to Buḍḍha-Nirvāṇa. Opinions are various on that event. "The Northern Buddhists give dates ranging from 2422 to 546 B.C., and the *Ain-i Akbari* of Abul Fazi fixes 1246 B.C., for

the event. The Tamil Manimegalai gives the year 1616 of some unknown era, probably of the Kali, and the Buddhists of Ceylon, Burma and Siam have uniformly been regulating their calendars on the basis that the Nirvana occurred in B.C. 543. The Western scholars are likewise as much divided in their opinion, though their dates range only from 544 to 370 B.C. Professors Rhys Davids and Kern give 412 and 388 B.C. respectively for the Para Nirvāna, whereas Max Muller to the last maintained that 477 B.C., was the correct date. Dr. Fleet considers the event to have taken place in B.C. 482<sup>1</sup> and Professor Oldenberg and M. Barth fix it in 480 B.C. Mr. V. A. Smith has given us three different dates, B.C. 508 in his 'Asoka', 487 in his 'Early India', and 480 to 470 B.C. in a recently published article."<sup>2</sup>

The Maurya dynasty ruled at Magadha according to the Purāṇas in 1535-1219 B.C. and Candragupta ascended the throne in 1538 B.C. But according to modern orientalists the Gupta era began somewhere about 325 B.C. There they vary in arranging the date of Candragupta's coronation between 325 and 312 B.C.,<sup>3</sup> such as 325, 321, 316, 315 and 312. For instance, V. Smith, as we have seen, fixes the coronation of Candragupta in 321 B.C. But Fleet has a word of condemnation:<sup>4</sup> "Mr. Smith's chronological details are even *inter se* wrong and irreconcilable. The most reliable tradition, adopted by Mr. Smith himself for other ends, gives an interval of 56 years from the commencement of the reign of Chandragupta to the *abhisheka* of Aśoka; yet on the same page, Mr. Smith has adopted only 52 years, placing the *abhisheka* of Aśoka in B.C. 269. And further, he has placed only three years earlier, in B.C. 272, that which he has termed the "accession"—(in reality, the usurpation)—of Aśoka; regardless of the fact that the same tradition makes that interval one of four years."<sup>5</sup> A chronology which includes such inconsistencies and errors as these in some of its radical details cannot in any way be accepted as final."

1. JRAS, (1906) 179 and 689.

2. Indian Review, VIII. 561.

3. See M. Senart, *IA*, XX, 229; V. Gobala Aiyar, *IA*, XXXVII, 341; Buhler, *IA*, VI. 149; *EI*, III. 184; Fleet, *JRAS*, (1904), 1; (1906), 988; V. Smith, *EHI*, 178.

4. JRAS, (1906), 984.

5. This is easily arrived at, by deduction, from the Dipavamsa, C, 2, 20, 21. It is expressly stated by the commentary on that work, the Mahavamsa, in the statement about Aśoka (Turnour 21 f.) that:—

Vemātika bhātare so hantvā ekunakam satam |  
sakale Jambudīpasmim ekarejjam apāpupi ||

In a paper read before the First Oriental Conference in Poona in 1919 on the same subject, the epoch of the Early Guptas, Hiralal Amritlal Shah of Bombay again considered the question, and adducing quite different reasons, arrived at about A.D. 200 for the initial date of the early Gupta era.

74. In a scholarly examination of the subject R. Shama Sastry thus summarises the results of his research :

“(1) Alberuni's statement that the Gupta Valabhi era A.D. 319-320 was started from the epoch of the extermination of the Guptas is shown to be correct, inasmuch as it is supported by the Prabhāvakacharita.

(2) The initial date of the early Gupta era, as distinguished from the Gupta-Valabhi era of A.D. 319-320, is fixed to lie in A.D. 200-201 on the authority of Jināsena's statement that Guptas ruled for 231 years and preceded the rule of Kalki whose birth date is fixed to be in the Mahāmāgha-samvatsara, A.D. 402 on the authority of Nemichandra's statement made in his Bāhubalīcharita that Chāmundaśāyā (A.D. 970-1030) set up the statue of Gomāteswara in Belgola on Sunday, the Chaitra sukla panchami of the year Vibhava in Kalki era 600 expired, corresponding to Sunday the 3rd March of A.D. 1028.

(3) With this starting point for the early Gupta era, the date of Śilāditya VII or Dhruvabhāṭa of Valabhi, Gupta samvatsara 447 comes out to be  $200-201+447=A.D. 647$ , making it possible for the Chinese traveller Hiuen Tsiang to meet him about A.D. 640.

(4) With this initial date of the early Guptas, the last date of Samudragupta's rule will be about A.D. 282 when or a little earlier he could possibly conquer the Shahan Shahis and the last king of the Murunda dynasty of Pataliputra, and when he could receive an embassy from Meghavarnābhaya, king of Ceylon, whose date of accession to the throne is A.D. 254.

(5) This initial date of the Early Guptas plus the inscriptional date

---

Jina-nibbānato pachoḥhā pure tassa=ābhisekato |  
 atthārasami vassa-satam dvayam evam vijānīyam ||  
 Patvā chātuhī vassehi ekarājja-mahāyaso |  
 pure Paṭaliputtasmiti attanam abhisechayī ||

“Having slain (his) brothers, born of various mothers, to the number of a hundred less by one, he attained sole sovereignty in the whole of Jambudvīpa. After the death of the Conqueror (Buddha), (and) before the anointment of him (Aśoka), (there were) 218 years; thus is it to be understood. Having reached (a point of time marked) by four years, he, possessed of the great glory of sole sovereignty, caused himself to be anointed at the town Paṭaliputta.

269 of Mahānāman's construction of a Vihara in Bodhgaya is shown to tally with the Ceylonese date of king Dhatusena (469) whose contemporary was Mahānāman, the priest and founder of the Vihara.

(6) It has also been shown how the last of the Āndhrabhṛitya kings Sātākarni duṭṭu-kulananda was contemporary with the first of the Guptas, the successors of the Brihadbāṇas in the north and how Mayurasarman, the first of the Kadambas and conqueror of the Brihadbāṇas in Mysore was contemporary with the same Sātākarni and how Kakutsthavarman living in the 80th year of Kadamba victory was contemporary with Chandragupta II living in the 82nd year of the Gupta era and probably gave his daughter in marriage to Chandragupta II.

(7) It is also shown how with this starting point for the Gupta era, Thursday coincides with Aśadha Sukla Dvādasi of Budhagupta's inscriptional date, G. S. 165. Here the year taken for verification is A.D. 200-201 + G. S. 165 expired = 365-366. The twelfth Tithi of Aśadha (June) A.D. 365 is shown to fall on Thursday.

(8) For the assumption that there were two Toramanas and two Mihirakulas, the Chinese accounts of the murder of Simha the 23rd Buddhist Patriarch, by Mihirakula in about 420 A.D. are to be relied upon. It is however immaterial whether this assumption proves acceptable or not, for the burden of proof for the starting point of the Early Gupta era in A.D. 200-201 does not depend upon it.

(9) As the Early Gupta era of A.D. 200-201 is shown to be quite different from the Gupta-Valabhi era used by the Huns and probably by the Parivrājaka Mahārājas, my scheme does not come into clash with Dr. Fleet's scheme.

(10) This scheme throws a flood of light on what has hitherto been regarded as a dark period between A.D. 200 and 300 in the History of India.<sup>1</sup>

75. Speaking of the Indian sources, Fleet writes (*IA*, XXX. 1 :

"We should not be able to deduce the date of Asoka from the Puranas. But we should find that the RAJATARANGINI would place him somewhere about B.C. 1260. We shall find, indeed, that the Nepal VAMSAVAṆI would place him, roughly, about B.C. 2600. As, however, that list does not mention him as a ruler of Nepal but only as a visitor to the country, we should probably infer a mistake in that account, and prefer to select the date of B.C. 1260. And then we should set about arranging the succession of the kings of India, itself, from the Puranas,

1. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* (1927).

with B.C. 1260 for the approximate date of the accession of Asoka as our starting-point."

76. In his dissertation on the Chronology of the Hindus, written in 1788 (As. Res. Vol. II, p. iii, reprint of 1799), Sir William Jones took a different starting-point and fixed it in a different way. His paper was based on a work entitled PURANARTHAPRAKASA, which was composed shortly before the time at which he was writing, by Pandit Radhakant Sarman and which seems to have been based, in its turn, chiefly on the BHAGAVATAPURANA. In the first place he brought forward a verse given to him from a book entitled BHAGAVATAMRITA, composed by "a learned GOSWAMI," which purported to fix the Kaliyuga year 1002 expired as the date of the manifestation of Buddha. With this he coupled an 'assertion in the same book that, two years before that date, there occurred the revolution which placed on the throne Pradyota, the first king in the third dynasty before that of the Mauryas. And he thus exhibited a chronology which, taking the accession of Pradyota in B.C. 2100 as its starting-point, placed the accession of Sisunaga in B.C. 1962, the accession of Nanda in B.C. 1602, and the accession of Candragupta (the grandfather of Asoka) in B.C. 1502, and made the dynasty of the Andhrabhṛtyas run from B.C. 908 to 432. But he considered that the figures put forward by the Puranas were excessive both for generations and for reigns. And adjusting those figures according to his own estimate, and taking, as a starting-point B.C. 1027 for the date of Buddha as fixed by the Chinese authorities as interpreted by De Geignes he submitted a revised scheme, which placed Pradyota B.C. 1029 Nanda B.C. 699, and the rise of the Andhrabhṛtyas in B.C. 140.

77. Patañjali mentions in Mahābhāṣya (I. 1, 68) 'Candragupta-sabbhā' and 'Puṣyamiṭra-sabbhā.' It is said that he mentions Mauryas in V. iii. 39 as the vendors of idol images or beggars carrying these idols but does not connect them with any of the ruling races at all. The reading of the word 'Maurya' seems to be wrong. "The old MSS. (of the Mahābhāṣya) of the South makes the allusion of making and selling idols apply not to Mauryas but to Pouras, a peculiar tribe also mentioned in the Vishnu Purana (IV. xxiv); for example MSS. Nos. 31, 33 of the Adyar Library, which are, on paleographical examination found to be more than 3 and 4 centuries old respectively, may be consulted. If "Pouras" be the right word, so much controversy about the allusion of Patañjali to the Mauryas will vanish at once."



78. Kalhaṇa's Rājataranginī is not after all an unreliable record. As a chronicle of Kashmir annals it is a true representation. Its importance in literary history lies in the variety and detail of traditional information it gives of past history over a long period of 3500 years. He wrote the introduction to his work in 1148 A.D. He might have been in error in saying that the Mahābhārata war was fought in 663 of Kali for there were two astronomical views on the movement of Saptarṣis and he chose one of them.<sup>1</sup>

Kalhaṇa says that the 24th year of the Laukika corresponded with the year 1070 of Śakakāla. "The year 1 of the Laukika coincided with 1047 of the Saka, or A.D. 1025; and as the cycle was a century one, the first year of each century must have corresponded with the 25th year of each Christian century."

79. **Loka Kala**, Laukikābda or Sapta-Rṣi-Kāla is so named after the Sapta-Rṣis seven Rṣis or the seven stars of the constellation of Great Bear. It is supposed that the Rṣis move from star to star once in a hundred years, but on the actual reckoning there is a difference of opinion between Vṛddha Garga and Purāṇas on the one side and Varāhamihira and other later astronomers on the other. "By the former it is said the seven rishis were in Māgha between 3177 and 3077 B.C., that is in B.C. 3101 at the beginning of the Kali-yuga; while by the latter they are placed in Māgha just 653 years later, between B.C. 2477 and 2377, that is in B.C. 2448. The reckoning of the Lok-Kal, as now used in Kashmir and the other hill states, is by the common luni-solar years beginning on Chaitrasuddi 1, or the new moon of Chaitra. The cycle consists of 27 centuries, each counting from 1 to 100 years, when a new reckoning is begun. The first year of each century corresponds with the 25th year of each Christian century."<sup>2</sup>

80. Modern historians are again uncertain on the date of Kaṇiṣka but the opinion prevails among them that he ruled in about 78 A.D. and according to some his name is connected with the Śāka era. If according to Kalhaṇa the reigns of kings that ruled in Kashmir after Kaṇiṣka made up a period of 2330 years up to his day, that is, the reign of King Jayasimha, Kalhaṇa would then go up to 78 plus 2330 to 2408 A.D., but we are now in 1937 A.D.<sup>3</sup>

1. See paras 184-188 on Kalhaṇa.

2. See for an elaborate discussion, Cunningham's *Indian Eras*.

3. On Kaṇiṣka, see V. Gopala Aiyar, *The Chronology of Ancient India*; V. E. Smith, *RII*, 82, 261; and *IA*, X. 213, XIII. 58, XXXV. 88, XLIII. 132, XLVI. 261; *IA* II, II. 26; *JA*, XXXII. 417.

81. The story of Candragupta as originally given in the *Bṛhat-kathā* in the *Pāṣāṇī* language by *Gupādhyā*, the prime minister of King *Śatavāhana* of *Pratiṣṭhāna*, and as we now have it in *Kaṭhāsariṭ-sāgara*, a true translation of the said work in Sanskrit by *Sōmadēva*, is somewhat different from the accounts given of that prince in the *Purāṇas* on the one hand, and in *Viśākhaḍaṭṭa's* *Mudrārākṣasa* and its commentary on the other.. Here Candragupta is represented as the only son of Nanda, the king of *Pāṭalīputra* and a contemporary of *Kāṭyāyana* *Vararuci*, the celebrated author of *Vārṭikas* and a disciple of *Varṣacārya*, under whom *Pāṇini* also first began to study Grammar.\*

82. The following are the passages of *Kaṭhāsariṭ-sāgara*, dealing with King Nanda and Candragupta :—

अत्रान्तरे तुषाराद्रौ कृत्वा तीव्रतरं तपः ।  
 आराधितं मया देवो वरदः पार्वतीपतिः ॥  
 लदेव तेन शास्त्रं मे पाणिनीयं प्रकाशितम् ।  
 तदिच्छानुग्रहादेव मया पूर्णीकृतं च तत् ॥  
 ... ..  
 वर्षोऽथ मन्मुखोऽद्वैच्छेत्तु व्याकरणं नवम् ।  
 ततः प्रकाशितं स्वाभिकुमारिण्यै तस्य तत् ॥  
 ततो व्याडोन्द्रदत्ताभ्यां विज्ञप्ते दक्षिणां प्रति ।  
 गुरुर्वर्षोऽब्रवीत् स्वर्णकोटिर्मे दीयतामिति ॥  
 अंगीकृत्य गुरोर्वर्ष्यं तौ च माभित्यवोचताम् ।  
 एहि राज्ञः सखे ! नन्दाद्याचितुं गुरुदक्षिणाम् ॥  
 गच्छामो नाऽन्यतोऽस्माभिरियत् काचनमाप्यते ।  
 नवाधिकाया नवतेः कोटीनामधिपो हि सः ॥  
 वाचा तेनोपकोशा च प्राग्धर्मसगिनीकृता ।  
 अतः स्यालः स तं किञ्चित् त्वदगुणैः समवाप्यते ॥  
 इति निश्चित्य नन्दस्य भूपतेः कटकं वयम् ।  
 अयोध्यास्थमगच्छाम स्तव्यः सबलचारिणः ॥  
 प्राप्तमालेषु चाऽस्मासु स राजा पञ्चतां गतः ।  
 राष्ट्रे कोलाहलं जातं विषादेन सहैव नः ॥  
 अबोधदिन्द्रदत्तोऽथ तत्क्षणं योगसिद्धिमात् ।  
 गतासोरस्य भूपस्य शरीरं प्रविशाम्सहम् ॥

अर्थी वररुचिर्मेऽस्तु दास्याम्यस्मै च काचनम् ।  
 व्याडी रक्षतु मे देहं ततः प्रत्यागमावधि ॥  
 इत्युक्त्वा नन्ददेहान्तरिन्द्रदत्तः समाविशत् ।  
 प्रत्युज्जीवति भूपे च राष्ट्रे तत्रोत्सवो ऽभवत् ॥  
 शून्ये देवगृहे देहमिन्द्रदत्तस्य रक्षितुम् ।  
 व्याडौ स्थिते गतोऽमूकमहं राजकुलं तदा ॥  
 प्रविश्य स्तस्त्रिकारं च विधाय गुरुदक्षिणाम् ।  
 योगनन्दो मया तत्र हेमकोटिं स याचितः ॥  
 ततः स शकटालाख्यं सत्यनन्दस्य मन्त्रिणम् ।  
 सुवर्णकोटिमेतस्मै दापयेति समादिशत् ॥  
 मृतस्य जीवितं दृष्ट्वा सद्यश्च प्राप्तिमार्थिनः ।  
 स तत्त्वं ज्ञातवान् मन्त्री किमन्नेयं हि धीभ्रताम् ॥  
 देव दीयत इत्युक्त्वा स च मन्त्रीत्यचिन्तयत् ।  
 नन्दस्य तनयो बालो राज्यं च बहुशत्रुमत् ॥  
 तत् सन्प्रत्यस्य रक्षामि तस्य देहमेपीदृशम् ।  
 निधिलैतत् स तत्कालं शवान् सर्वानदाहत् ॥  
 चारैरन्विष्य तन्मध्ये लब्ध्वा देवगृहात्ततः ।  
 व्याडिं विभूय तद् दधमिन्द्रदत्तकलेबरम् ॥

... ..

अथेत्स योगनन्दस्य व्याडिना क्रन्दितं पुरः ।  
 अन्नक्षण्यमनुत्क्रान्तजीवो योगस्थितो द्विजः ॥  
 अनाद्यशब्द इत्यथ ब्रह्माक्षस्तबोदये ।  
 तच्छ्रुत्वा योगनन्दस्य काऽप्यवस्थाऽभवच्छ्रुत्वा ॥  
 देहदाहात् स्थिरे तस्मिन् जाते निर्गत्य मे ददौ ।  
 सुवर्णकोटिं स ततः शकटालो महामतिः ॥  
 योगनन्दोऽथ विजने सशोको व्याडिमग्नवीत् ।  
 शूरीभूतोऽस्मि त्रिभोऽपि किं श्रिया स्थिरयापि मे ॥  
 तच्छ्रुत्वाऽश्वास्य तं व्याडिः कालोचितमावत ।  
 ज्ञातोऽसि शकटालेन तदेनं निन्तयाऽधुना ॥  
 महामन्त्रीन्नयं लेख्यमपि त्वां विनाशयेत् ।  
 पूर्वमन्दसुतं कुर्यान्नम्रगुप्तं हि भूमिपम् ॥

तरमाद्वररुचि मन्त्रिमुख्यत्वे कुरु येन ते ।  
 एतद्बुद्ध्या भवेद्राज्यं स्थिरं दिव्यानुभावया ॥  
 इत्युक्तवैव गते व्याडौ दातुं तां गुरुदक्षिणाम् ।  
 तदैवाऽऽजीय दत्ता मे योगनन्देन मन्त्रिता ॥

इति कथापीठलम्बके, पंचमस्तरंगः ॥

दिवसेष्वथ गच्छत्सु तत् तपोवनमकदा ।  
 अयोध्यात उपागच्छत् विप्र एको मयि स्थिते ॥  
 स मया योगनन्दस्य राज्यवार्तामपृच्छयत् ।  
 प्रत्यभिज्ञाय मां सोऽथ सशोकमिदं मब्रवीत् ॥  
 शृणु नन्दस्य यदवृत्तं तत्सकाशाद्रते त्वयि ।  
 लम्बावत्पाशस्तत्वाऽभूच्छकटालक्षिरेण सः ॥  
 म चिन्तयन् वधोपाये योगनन्दस्य युक्तिः ।  
 क्षितिं खनन्तमद्रार्क्षिचाणक्याख्यं द्विजं पथि ॥  
 किं भवे खनसीत्युक्तं तेन विश्रांस्थ सोऽब्रवीत् ।  
 दर्भमुन्मूलयाम्यथ पादो ह्येतेन मे क्षतः ॥  
 तच्छ्रुत्वा सहसा मन्त्री कोपनं कूरनिश्चयम् ।  
 तं विप्रं योगनन्दस्य वधोपायममन्यत ॥  
 नाम पृष्ट्वाऽब्रवीत् तं च हे ब्रह्मन् ! दापयामि ते ।  
 अहं तयोदशीश्राद्धे गृहे नन्दस्य भूपतेः ॥  
 दक्षिणातः सुवर्णस्य लक्षं तव भविष्यति ।  
 भोक्ष्यसे धुरि साऽन्येषां एहि तावद्गृहे मम ॥  
 इत्युक्त्वा शकटालस्तं चाणक्यमनयद्गृहम् ।  
 श्राद्धाहोऽदर्शयन् ते च राज्ञं स श्रद्धे च तम् ॥  
 ततः स गत्वा चाणक्यो धुरि श्राद्ध उपाविशत् ।  
 मुबन्धनामा विप्रश्च तामेच्छद्गुरुरात्मनः ॥  
 तद् गत्वा शकटालेन विहसतो नन्दभूपतिः ।  
 अवादीश्राप्सरो योग्यः मुबन्धुर्धुरि तिष्ठतु ॥  
 आगन्त्येतां च राजाज्ञां शकटालो भयानतः ।  
 न मेऽपराध इत्युक्त्वा चाणक्याय न्यवेदयत् ॥  
 सोऽथ कोपनं चाणक्योऽब्रुवाञ्चि स मन्ततः ।  
 निजो मूकश्च शिष्यो तव प्रतिज्ञासकरोदिभाम् ॥

अवश्यं हन्त ! नन्दोऽयं सप्तभिर्दिवसैर्मया ।  
 विनाशयो बन्धनीया च ततो निर्मन्थुना शिखा ॥  
 इत्युक्तवन्तं कुपिते योगनन्दे पलायितम् ।  
 अलक्षितं स्वगेहे ते शकटालेन न्यवेशयत् ॥  
 तत्रोपकरणे दत्ते गुप्तं तेनैव मन्त्रिणा ।  
 स चाणक्यो द्विजः क्वाऽपि गत्वा कृत्याभमाधयत् ॥  
 तद्वशाद्योगनन्दोऽथ दाहज्वरमवाप्य सः ।  
 सप्तमे दिवसे प्राप्तिं पञ्चत्वं समुपागमत् ॥  
 हत्वा हिरण्यगुप्तं च शकटालेन तत्सुतम् ।  
 पूर्वैनन्दसुते लक्ष्मीधन्द्रगुप्ते निवेशिता ॥  
 मन्त्रित्वे तस्य चाऽऽयस्य बृहस्पतिसमं धिया ।  
 चाणक्ये स्थापयित्वा तं स मन्त्री कृतकृत्यः ॥  
 सन्वानो योगनन्दस्य कृतवैरप्रतिक्रियः ।  
 पुलशोकेन निर्विण्णः प्रविशेश महद्रनम् ॥  
 इति कथापीठलम्बके षष्ठः सर्गः

The above passage has been briefly translated by H. H. Wilson as follows :—

" After living for a considerable period in my hermitage, the death of Yogananda was thus related to me by a Brāhman, who was travelling from Ayodhya and had rested at my cell. Śakātāla, brooding on his plan of revenge, observed one day a Brāhman of mean appearance digging in a meadow, and asked him what he was doing there. Chānakya, the Brāhman, replied : " I am rooting out this grass which has hurt my foot." The reply struck the minister as indicative of a character which would contribute to his designs, and he engaged him by the promise of a large reward and high honour, to come and preside at the Śrāddha, which was to be celebrated next new moon at the palace. Chānakya arrived, anticipating the most respectful treatment, but Yogananda had been previously persuaded by Śakātāla to assign precedence to another Brāhman, Subandhu, so that when Chānakya came to take this place, he was thrust from it with contumely. Burning with rage, he threatened the king before all the court, and announced his death within seven days. Nanda ordered him to be turned out of the palace, Śakātāla received him into his house and persuading Chānakya that he was wholly innocent of being instrumental to his ignominious treatment, and contributed to encourage and inflame his in-

dignation. Chānakya thus protected, practised a magical rite, in which he was a proficient; and by which, on the seventh day Nanda was deprived of life Śakatāla, on the father's death, effected the destruction of Hiranyagupta, his son, and raised Chandragupta, the son of genuine Nanda to the throne. Chānakya became the prince's minister; and Śakatāla having attained the only object of his existence, retired to end his days in the woods."<sup>1</sup>

83. According to Kathāsarit-Sāgara therefore Candragupta was the only son of the genuine-king Nanda, and was very young when the genuine Nanda passed away and Indradatta entered the dead body of the king and began to rule the kingdom; so he was called by the name Yoga Nanda. Yogananda begot a son on the queen of the late real or Satya Nanda and he was named Hiranyagupta. Besides the mention of these two persons, there is no reference to "Nanda and his eight sons" anywhere in the said poem. These passages also show that Candragupta was but a king in name, that he was in no sense a usurper or adventurer, that he took no active part at all in establishing himself on the throne of Nanda, that it was Śakatāla, the old minister of the king, and Cānakya, a Brahman sage of great learning and determination that planned the death of Yogananda and of his son Hiranyagupta, and raised the young prince Candragupta, the legitimate son of the genuine Nanda to the throne of Magadha. Nowhere is there any reference to this Candragupta being a conquerer of enemies or of having received ambassadors from foreign princes, either at Pataliputra or Ayodhya, the permanent and temporary capitals, and it is at Ayodhya the revolution came off on the death of king Nanda, leading to the elevation of Candragupta to the throne.

84. The statements of the early European writers may now be summed up:—(a) At the time of Alexander's invasion, the Prasi or eastern kingdom of Magadha was ruled over by a king Xandrames; according to the officers of Alexander sent to investigate the country living ahead, and also according to Poros whom Alexander consulted, Xandrames was a powerful king who could bring into the field 20,000 horse, 200,000 foot, 2900 chariots and 4000 or 3000 elephants; he was nevertheless of mean origin; the queen of his predecessor had fallen

1. (Vide Appendix II to the Preface of his *Mudrarakshasa*, *The Theatre of the Hindus*, II. 140-141).

2. McCrindle's collection and translation of all the passages from classical writers in six books are regarded as reliable by Vincent Smith, of which *Indika* of Megasthenes and *Arrian* are instructive.

in love with him and had helped him to murder her husband; and therefore he was very unpopular with his subjects. (b) Sandrocottos or Androcottos as a young prince had met Alexander, and had offended him and incurred his displeasure; but after the retreat of Alexander he put himself at the head of a band of robbers, drove out the prefects of Alexander, and made himself king. (c) Seleukus Nikator tried to regain the Indian conquests of Alexander, but found it wiser to contract an alliance with him.<sup>1</sup> (d) Megasthenes the ambassador of Seleucus dwelt at the court of Sandracypus and wrote an account of those in whose midst he lived (from which account later writers have quoted copiously).

"The Greek writers mention as many as six names or variations, Xandrames, Andrames, Agrammes, Sandrocottus and Sandrocypus. Whether these apply to one or more than one individual; and Max Muller was not sure but in his obdurate zeal to demonstrate the identity he said "Xandrames.....is the last king of the empire conquered by Sandracotus. If however it should be maintained that those two names were intended for one and the same king, the explanation would still be very easy. For Chandragupta is also called Chandra, and Chandramas in Sanskrit is a synonym for Chandra."<sup>2</sup>

85. What was discovered was simply this—that in the celebrated inscriptions of king Priyadarsin—Rock Edicts III and XIII—Antiochus and Ptolemy are mentioned as Priyadarsin's contemporaries. There is nothing in the inscriptions to show that Priyadarsin was Aśoka Maurya, grandson of Candragupta Maurya. Strict logic will justify only one inference from the first Greek Synchronism—that Sandrocottus whoever he was was the contemporary of Seleukus Nikator; and only one from the second—that Priyadarsin was the contemporary of a Greek ruler Antiochus. Unless proof is forth coming to show that either Sandrocottus or Priyadarsin was a Maurya King, it is wrong to say as Vincent Smith does say, that by the discovery of these two synchronisms "the chronology of the Maurya dynasty was placed on firm footing, and is no longer open to doubt in its main outlines."

86. Who was Xandrames? Let us compare the Greek and the Indian versions, understanding Xandramas to be the predecessor of Sandrocottus. First in Indian traditions Nanda, or more precisely Sumālya Nanda, was the immediate predecessor of Candragupta Maurya. If therefore by Sandrocottus we are to understand Candragupta Maurya,

---

1. V. Smith, *MHI*, 140.

2. *ASL*, 148.

we must identify Xandrames with Nanda. This is exactly what is done by almost all Orientalists like Vincent Smith, with a vague statement "that the king of the Gangaridie and Parsii.....was named, as nearly as the Greeks could catch the unfamiliar sounds, Xandrames or Agrammes.....who *must have been* one of the Nandas mentioned in native tradition"<sup>1</sup> and that somehow in order to maintain the hypothesis, Xandrames *must be* identified with Nanda. Max Muller as a philologist is convinced that Greek Xandrames is Sanskrit 'Chandramas or Chandra,' and rather than ignore grammar he is for identifying Xandrames and Sandrocottus. Secondly the Greek account of Xandrames does not tally either with Hindu or with Buddhist versions of Nanda. According to them Mahāpadma, first king of the Nanda dynasty, was the son of the last Śaiśunāga King Mahānandin by a Śūdra wife, and was a powerful, avaricious, wicked king, having Kṣatriya wives, but there is no allusion to any of his father's wives having become his paramour. The Purāṇic writers, had no love for Mahāpadma and they would certainly have mentioned such an incident in his life, if it really referred to him. His father Mahānandin is nowhere stated to have been murdered whether by Mahāpadma or his paramour. Thus neither from the name nor from the description, can Xandrames be reasonably identified with Nanda.

87. We have no less difficulty in identifying Sandrocottus or Sandrocyptus with Candragupṭa Maurya. The description given of the mighty Sandrocottus by the Greeks cannot possibly compare with any Indian account whatsoever of Candragupṭa Maurya, who, far from being a great conqueror, owed his elevation and rule entirely to the Brāhmaṇa Cāṇakya or Kauṭilya. The Hindu and the Buddhist versions are agreed here. Max Muller's explanation is only this, that because Candragupṭa Maurya was grandfather of the great Buddhist Emperor Aśoka, therefore the Brahmanas unduly lowered him, and the Buddhists as excessively exalted him, and that is mere fancy. The part played by Rākṣasa, the devoted minister of the Nandas at first and of Candragupṭa at last, and the power exercised throughout by the Brahman Cāṇakya over Candragupṭa amply indicate that Candragupṭa and his immediate predecessors were in no way considered anti-brahmanical. Even King Priyadarsin of the Edicts was no persecutor of the Brahmanas, for in his inscriptions he always enjoins *the highest respect for "brahmanas" and sramanas.*"

---

1. *EHI*, 40.



88. The identification of Rāja Priyadarśin with Rāja Aśoka was based *entirely* upon Ceylonese Buddhist chronicles. Talboys Wheeler wrote in 1874, "The identification of Rāja Priyadarsin of the Edicts with Rāja Asoka of the Buddhist chronicles was first pointed out by Mr. Turnour who rested it upon a passage in the *Dipāvamsa*. The late Prof. Wilson objected to this identification."<sup>1</sup> Prof. Rhys David declared "It is not too much to say that without the help of the Ceylon Books, the striking identification of the King Piyadassi of the edicts with the king Asoka of history would never have been made."<sup>2</sup> But the Ceylon chronicles are admitted to be utterly worthless as history and according to Wheeler "the Buddhist chronicles.....might be dismissed as a monkish jumble of myths and names,"<sup>3</sup> and even Vincent Smith in the preface to his *Asoka* himself said "I reject absolutely the Ceylonese chronology..... The undeserved credit given to the monks of Ceylon has been a great hindrance to the right understanding of ancient Indian history." And yet it is on such undeserved credit that the identity of Priyadarśin with Aśoka Maurya rests to this day.

89. In the literature of India there is no allusion anywhere to an invasion or inroad into India by foreign nations up to the time of the Āṇḍhra kings; and the only person who bore the name of Candragupta answering to the description of Sandracottus of the Greeks who flourished about the time of Alexander the Great in India, according to the Purāṇas, was Candragupta of the Guṇṭa Dynasty who established the mighty empire of the Guṇṭas on the ruins of the already decayed Āṇḍhra Dynasty about 281 years after the Mahābhārata War, corresponding to 328 B.C., but he is now being placed in the 4th century A.D., on the sole strength of this mistaken Greek Synchronism by our Savants of Indian history. God save us from our friends!

90. Beyond the verbal resemblance of Candragupta and Sandracottus and Pāṭalīputra and Pālībōtra, there is nothing to justify the identification of Candragupta Maurya and Sandracottus of the Greeks. No attempt has been made to explain the various names Xandrames, Andrames, Andracottus, Sandracottus, Sandrocypus, and Sandrocypus as used by the Greek writers to denote *three different persons*, as referring respectively to the last king of the previous dynasty, the usurper who has been actually reigning at Pāṭalīputra at the time when Alexander

1. *History of India*, Hindu, Buddhist and Brahmanical, 230.

2. *Buddhist India*, 273.

3. *BHI*, 171.

invaded India, and the king who concluded a treaty with Seleucus Nicator at the instance of Megasthenes. These facts would equally apply, if not more pointedly, to Candragupta of the Gupta Dynasty who usurped the throne of Candrasātri, the last virtual king of the Āndhra Dynasty, under the pretext of acting as guardian and regent of his minor son Pulōman and who was succeeded by Samudragupta who established himself on the throne of his father with the aid of vagabonds and banditti at Patālīpuṭra, and who is distinctly stated in inscriptions to have received ambassadors from various foreign princes, to have conquered the whole of India, then extending far beyond its present limits, and to have performed even an *Aśvamedha* sacrifice in honour of his glorious victories.

91. Kaliyugarājavarṇāṇṭa, which is a part of Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa, describes the last two kings of the Āndhra dynasty and the advent of Gupta dynasty thus :

चन्द्रश्रीशतकर्णस्तु त्रीणि वर्षाणि लोक्ष्यति ।  
 वासिष्ठपुत्रनाम्ना तु ख्यातो यश्च भविष्यति ॥  
 पुलोमांसपि तथा चान्यस्समासत भविष्यति ।  
 वटोटकचस्य पुत्रेण चन्द्रगुप्तेन पालितः ॥  
 एते द्वात्रिंशदान्ध्रास्तु मोक्ष्यन्ते वसुधामिमाम् ।  
 शतानि पञ्च पूर्णानि तेषां राज्यं भविष्यति ॥  
 तेषां तु संस्थिते राज्ये भूमिर्युप्तान् गमिष्यति ।  
 श्रीपार्वतीयान्ध्रतया इत्याख्यां यान्ति ये नृपाः ॥  
 \* \* \*  
 अथ श्रीचन्द्रगुप्ताः : पार्वतीयकुलोद्भवः ।  
 श्रीपर्वतेन्द्राधिपतेः पौत्रः श्रीगुप्तमुपतेः <sup>1</sup>॥  
 श्रीवटोटकचगुप्तस्य तनयोऽसितविक्रमः ।  
 कुमारदेवीमुद्राया नेपालाधीशितुः सुताम् ॥

1. The names underlined like this, श्रीगुप्त, चन्द्र (=इन्दु), स्कन्द, कुमार etc., are mentioned in order silly by Kālidāsa in Raghuvamśa (I. 11-13) e.g.,

- i आसीन्सहस्रितामाद्यः प्रणवच्छन्दसामिव
- ii इन्दुः क्षीरनिवाविव
- iii व्यूहोरस्को वृषस्कन्धः ।

Here the word श्री a single letter, is compared with the word औ—a single letter of great sanctity. In I. 81, Kālidāsa says that Sudākṣiṇā was a Magadha princess, thus suggesting that Kālidāsa had in mind Magadha kingdom when he wrote this poem.

लक्ष्मप्रवेशं राज्येऽस्मिन् लिच्छवीनां सहायतः ।  
सेनाध्यक्षपदं प्राप्य नानासैन्यसमन्वितः ॥

लिच्छवीयां समुद्राद् देव्याश्चन्द्रश्रियोऽनुनाम् ।  
राष्ट्रियस्यालको भूत्वा राजपत्न्या च चोदितः ॥

चन्द्रश्रियं घातयित्वा मिषेणैव हि केनचित् ।  
तत्पुत्रप्रतिभूत्वे च राज्या चैव नियोजितः ॥

वैश्वस्तु सप्तमिः प्राप्तराज्यो वीराप्रणीरसौ ।  
तत्पुत्रं च पुलोमानं विनिहत्य नृपार्मकम् ॥

आन्ध्रेभ्यो मागधं राज्यं प्रसङ्गाऽपहरिष्यति ।  
कचेन स्तेन पुत्रेण लिच्छवीयेन संयुतः ॥

विजयादित्यनाम्ना तु सप्त पालयिता सप्तः ।  
स्नानाम्ना च शकं त्वेकं स्थापयिष्यति भूतले ॥

एकच्छत्रश्चक्रवर्ती पुत्रस्तस्य महायशः ।  
नेपालाधीशदौहित्रो म्लेच्छसैन्यैः समवृतः ॥

वञ्चकं पितरं हत्वा सहपुत्रं सनान्धवम् ।  
अशोकादित्यनाम्ना तु प्रख्यातो जगतीतले ॥

स्वयं विगतशोकश्च मातरं चाऽसिनन्दयन् ।  
समुद्रयुतो भविता सार्वभौमस्ततः परम् ॥

विजित्य सकलामुर्वीं धर्मपुत्र इवाऽपरः ।  
समाहरन् च मेघं यथाशास्त्रं द्विजोत्तमैः ॥

स्वदेशीयैर्विदेशीयैर्नृपैः सममिपूजितः ।  
शास्त्रसाहित्यसङ्गीतरासिकः कविमिस्तुतः ॥

समुद्रयुतः पृथिवीं चतुःसागरवेष्टिताम् ।  
पञ्चाशतं तथा चैकां भोक्ष्यत्येवैकराट् समाः ॥

तस्य पुत्रोऽपरश्चन्द्रगुप्ताख्यो वीरकेसरी ।  
यवनैश्च तथा हूणान् देशाद्विद्रावयन् बलात् ॥

विक्रमादित्यवन्निलं पण्डितैः परिसेवितः ।  
श्रुतिस्मृतिपुराणेतिहासकाव्यविचक्षणः ॥

विक्रमादित्य इत्येव मुक्नेषु प्रभां गतः ।  
सप्तसिन्धून्-समुत्तीर्य बाह्लिकदीन् विजित्य च ॥

सुराष्ट्रदेशपर्यन्तं कर्तिस्तस्मै समुच्छ्रयन् ॥  
 पट्टतिशब्दोक्ष्यति समास्त्वैकच्छत्रां वसुन्धराम् ॥  
 कुमारगुप्तस्तुत्रो वदेवीसमुद्भवः ।  
 कुमार इव देवरीन् विजेज्यविजविद्विषः ॥  
 समाहर्ताऽथमथस्य महेन्द्रादित्यनामतः ।  
 चत्वारिंशत्समा द्वे च पृथिवौ पालयिष्यति ॥  
 स्कन्दगुप्तोऽपि तत्पुत्रः साक्षान् स्कन्द इवाऽपरः ।  
 दृणदर्पहरश्चण्डः पुष्यसेननिपूदनः ॥  
 पराक्रमादित्यनाम्ना विख्यातो धरणीतले ।  
 शासिष्यति महीं कृत्स्नां पञ्चविंशतिवत्सरान् ॥  
 ततो नृसिंहगुप्तश्च बालादित्य इति ध्रुतः ।  
 पुत्रः प्रकाशादित्यस्य अश्वरगुप्तस्य भूपतेः ॥  
 नियुक्तः स्वपितृव्येन स्कन्दगुप्तेन जीवता ।  
 पित्रैव याकं भविता चत्वारिंशत् समा नृपः ॥  
 अन्यः कुमारगुप्तोऽपि पुत्रस्तस्य महायशः ।  
 क्रमादित्य इति ख्यातो दृणैर्युद्धं समाचरन् ॥  
 विजिलेशानवर्मादीन् भट्टार्केणाऽनुसेवितः ।  
 चतुश्चत्वारिंशदेव समा भोक्ष्यति मेदिनीम् ॥  
 एते प्रणतसामन्ताः श्रीमद्गुप्तकुलोद्भवाः ।  
 श्रीपार्वतीयान्ध्रसूत्यनामानश्चक्रवर्तिनः ॥  
 महाराजाधिराजादिबिरुदावब्यलङ्कृताः ।  
 भोक्ष्यन्ति द्वे शते पञ्चचत्वारिंशच्च वै समाः ॥  
 मागधानां महाराज्यं छिन्नं सिन्नं च सर्वशः ।  
 साकमेतैर्महागुप्तवंश्यैर्यास्यति संस्थितिम् ॥

—Bhāga III, Chapter 3.

To translate a few of these verses :

“Chandrasri Satakarni, known also as the son of Vashishthi will enjoy (the kingdom) for 3 years. After him yet another Puloma, will be king for 7 years under the protection of Chandragupta, son of Ghatotkacha. These thirty-two Andhra kings (already enumerated) will enjoy the earth ; and their reign will cover full 500 years (in round

numbers . While they are yet on the throne, the country will pass to the Guptas who will be known as the *sriparvatiya andhrabritya* kings (i.e., those that had come from Sriparvata, and had been in the service of the Andhras).....And so the valiant Chandragupta, the head of the Parvatiya clan, grandson of the ruler of Sriparvata named Srigupta, and son of Ghatotkacha Gupta, will marry Kumaradevi daughter of the king of Nepal. Then with the help of the Lichchhavis he will gain influence in the Government (of Andhras), become the Commander-in-chief, and head of a large army. He will marry a Lichchhavi Princess, the younger sister of the Queen of Chandrasri, and thus will become the King's brother-in-law; And instigated by the Queen he, by some stratagem, will get King Chandrasri killed. He will be appointed Regent in place of her son by the Queen; and in seven years he, undaunted, will become sovereign himself, after killing the young Prince Puloman. And thus by force he will seize the Kingdom from the Andhras, and will rule Magadha along (or jointly) with Kacha, his son by the Lichchhavi wife. He will reign for seven years under the title of *Vijayaditya* and shall establish on earth an era in his own name."

"After that (i.e., after Chandragupta) his son, son likewise of the daughter of the King of Nepal, with the aid of Mlechchha bands, will slay his treacherous father together with his son and other (unfriendly) relations. He will be known on earth under the title of *Asokaditya*; himself freed from all misery, (spiritually?) and causing joy to his mother, Samudragupta will become supreme ruler of earth. He will conquer the whole world like a second Dharmaputra, and with the help of Brahmanas he will perform the horse-sacrifice according to the scriptures. He will be honoured by (subject) Kings both in his own and in foreign countries; and will be praised by poets for his learning and talents in music. Thus Samudragupta will reign supreme over the earth from sea to sea (*lit.* surrounded by the four oceans)."

92. This eulogy should bring to mind at once the Greek picture of Sandrocottus. The sensitiveness of Prince Samudra must have been stung by his father's undue favouritism towards Kaca. The statement that Chandragupta ruled along with Kaca not merely indicates the cause of quarrel between Samudragupta and his father; it explains also the numismatic puzzle as to how Kaca's coins came to be struck. Thus, then, Androkottus of Plutarch who tried to persuade Alexander to invade the Prasii, but whose "insolent behaviour" according to Justin led to a quarrel between him and Alexander, the Androkottus who

afterwards collected bands of robbers and drove out the præfects of Alexander, who was called to royalty by the power of the Gods and by prodigies, who overthrew Xandrames, and humbled Seleucus Nikator, was the same as Samuḍragupṭa who with Mleccha troops overthrew his "treacherous" father, and whose conquests inscribed by Harisena on "Asoka's pillar" at Allahabad amply bear out the statement of the Purāṇas that Samuḍragupṭa was supreme ruler of the earth from sea to sea, to whom even Ceylon and Bactria and Assyria paid homage. And this same Samuḍragupṭa "the Indian Napoleon" of Vincent Smith, was the Sandrocottos of Megasthenes; and he reigned for fifty-one years. Samuḍragupṭa like all the Guṭṭas had a title ending in *āditya*. he was *ASOKADITYA*!

93. SANDROCOTTOS WAS ALSO PRIYADASSI.—We have read of "Asoka: the Buddhist Emperor of India" and "The first and most authentic records are the rock and pillar edicts of Raja Priyadasi.....the reputed grandson of Sandrocottos.....The second.....consist of the Buddhist Chronicles of the Rajah of Megadha."<sup>1</sup> From a careful study of these two classes of records Talboys Wheeler whose "History of India" appeared in 1874, that is, before the traditional conventions of Orientalists took the fatally rigid shape which they have since assumed, drew his picture of Rāja Priyadarśi Aśoka and found how like his picture was to that of the Greek Sandrocottus as depicted by Megasthenes. Aśoka, while young,<sup>2</sup> "was at variance with his father and seems to have gone into exile like another Rama. He is said to have been appointed to the Government of the distant province of Ujjain, and subsequently to have repressed a revolt in Taxila in the Panjab .....The main incidents of Asoka's early career thus present a strange similarity to those recorded of Sandrocottos by Greek writers. Sandrocottos was also an exiled prince from Pataliputra; and he ultimately drove the Greeks from Taxila. Again Asoka usurped a throne and founded an empire; so did Sandrocottos. Asoka originally professed the Brahmanical religion, and then embraced the more practical religion of the edicts. Sandrocottos sacrificed to the Gods in Brahmanical fashion; but he also held a great assembly every year in which every discovery was discussed which was likely to prove beneficial to the earth, to mankind and to animals generally.....It would be a startling coincidence if the great sovereign whose religion of duty without deity has been engraven for more than twenty centuries on the rocks

1. Talboys Wheeler's *History of India, Hindu Buddhist, and Brahmanical* p. 209.

2. *Ibid.* pp. 281, 487.

and pillars of India, should prove to be the same prince who met Alexander at Taxila, who offended the Macedonian conqueror by his insolence and assumption, who expelled the Greeks from the Panjab during the wars of Alexander's successors, and ultimately married the daughter of Seleukos Nikator." In fact Talboys Wheeler had little doubt that Sandrokottos of the Greeks and Aśoka of the Buddhists were identical. In one or two places he calls Aśoka "the reputed grandson of Sandrocottus or Chandragupta"<sup>1</sup> and adds in a note "The term 'reputed grandson' is here used advisedly. It will appear hereafter<sup>2</sup> that there is reason to believe that the name Sandrocottos and Aśoka are applied to the same individual."<sup>2</sup> The title *Aśokaḍḍiya*, applied to the king in the *Kaliyugarājavṛttānta* confirms the conjecture made by Talboys Wheeler from internal evidence.

**94. Asoka and Samudragupta :—**The correspondence between these two names rests on not mere fancy. Aśoka is said to have resented the ill-treatment accorded to him by his father; so did Samudragupta resent. Aśoka in becoming a King became a parricide,<sup>4</sup> or fratricide also; so did Samudragupta become too. Both were Hindus at the outset. Special mention is made of the conquest of Kalinga by both. Aśoka was converted to Buddhism by Upagupta,<sup>5</sup> who is described as a blood-relation of Aśoka's. Samudragupta, it is admitted, was a pupil of the celebrated Buddhist teacher Vasubandhu. Aśoka of the edicts though an earnest Buddhist enjoined the highest respect for Brāhmaṇas. Samudragupta, though an 'orthodox Hindu' was a great patron of Buddhism; and throughout the Gupta period "the Buddhist rule of life was observed...Buddhist monasteries were liberally endowed by royal grants."<sup>6</sup> Both Aśoka and Samudragupta had intimate relations with Ceylon, with Bactria and other foreign countries.<sup>7</sup> These correspondences cannot fail to establish the identity of the two Emperors. Vincent Smith claims that modern oriental investigators have unearthed the history of Samudragupta, and wonders how "this great king, warrior, poet, and musician who conquered nearly all India,

1. *Ibid.*, pp. 209 and 476.

2. *i.e.*, p. 487.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 476.

4. Harīṣena makes special mention that Samudragupta was received by his father with open arms. Where was the need for this special mention unless it were intended to contradict current beliefs to the contrary?

5. Vincent Smith's *Early History*, p. 159.

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 282, 328-334, 297.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 286.

and whose alliances extended from the Oxus to Ceylon was unknown even by name to the historians of India."<sup>1</sup> The explanation is simple, Aśoka, the title assumed by the emperor, completely replaced his personal name, and became a household word all over India; it was carried to Ceylon in the anecdotes regarding Raja Prāyadaśī Aśoka. But Samuḍraguṭṭa was known to the Greeks as Sandrocottos only, and the name was also inscribed on the coins which lost to mediæval India have now been discovered.

95. —Aśoka's pillar at Allahabad may, in one word, be said to link together all the three groups of contemporary evidence. It is the pillar of Samuḍraguṭṭa Aśoka Priyadarśin. The Greeks knew him not as Priyadarśin because Megasthenes had left Palibothra before Sandrocottus became a Buddhist. The Ceylonese Buddhists knew not of the Hindu Samuḍraguṭṭa but only the Buddhist Priyadarśin. In India itself, except in popular tales about Aśoka, both the names Samuḍraguṭṭa and Priyadarśin were forgotten; the older Purāṇic accounts all close with the Āṇḍhra line of kings practically. The monuments were all pulled down by the Mahomedan invaders.

Thus we see that the Gupta dynasty ruled from 328 B.C. to 83 B.C., and of these kings Candraguṭṭa ruled from 328 to 321 (7 years) and Samuḍraguṭṭa for 51 years from 321 to 270 B.C. This would make this Candraguṭṭa and Samuḍraguṭṭa contemporaries of Alexander, Seleukus Nicator and Antiochus. IS THIS THE CORRECT SYNCHRONISM?

96. Here is an inscription on the metal pillar in Buddha Gaya of a king CANDRA :

यस्योद्वर्तयतः प्रतापपुरसा शत्रून्समेत्यागतान्  
 बह्वेवाहवर्तनोमीलिखित्वा सुहगेन कीर्तिभुजे ।  
 तीर्त्वा सप्तमुखानि येन समरे सिन्धोर्जिता बाल्हिकाः  
 यस्याद्याप्यधिवास्यते जलनिधिर्व्यानिर्लेदक्षिणः ॥  
 खिन्नस्येव विसृज्य गां नरपतेर्गामाश्रितस्येतरां  
 मूर्त्या कर्मजितावनि गतवतः कीर्त्या स्थितस्य क्षितौ ।  
 शान्तस्येव महावने (हुतभुजो) यस्य प्रतापो महान्  
 नाद्याप्युत्सृजति प्रणाशितरिपोऽर्थस्य शेषः क्षितिम् ॥  
 प्राप्तेन स्वभुजाञ्जितञ्च सुचिरञ्चैकधिराज्यं क्षितौ  
 चन्द्राह्नेन समप्रचन्द्रसदृशीं तन्वाश्रियं निभ्रता ।



तेनायं प्रणिधाय भूमिपतिना सन्नेन विष्णोर्मां मतिं  
प्रांशुर्विष्णुपदे गिरौ भगवतो विष्णोर्ध्वजः स्थापितः ॥

"He, on whose arm fame was inscribed by the sword, when in battle in the Vanga countries (Bengal), he kneaded (and turned) back with (His) Breast the enemies who uniting together, come against (Him), he, by whom, having crossed in warfare, the seven mouths of the (River) Sindhu, the Vahlikas were conquered, he by the breezes of whose powers the Southern ocean is even still perfumed. He, the remnant of the great zeal of whose energy; which utterly destroys (his) enemies (like the remnant of the great glowing heat) of a turned out fire in a great forest, even now leaves not the earth; though, he, the king, as if wearied has quitted this earth, and gone to the other world, moving in (bodily) form to the land of paradise won by (the merits of his) actions, (but) remaining on this earth by (the memory of his) fame; —By him, the King,—who attained sole supreme sovereignty in the world, acquired by his own arm and (enjoyed) for a very long time, (and) who having the name of Chandra, carried a beauty of countenance like (the beauty of) the full moon having in faith fixed his mind upon the (God), Vishnu, this lofty standard of divine Vishnu was set up on the hill (called) Vishnupada."

97. By this indictment of the present condition of Indian historical studies it is not in the least meant to belittle the labours of those illustrious savants of Sanskrit learning, who had left their countries and devoted their time and means for the understanding and dissimulation of India's ancient literature. India owes to them a debt of gratitude, which lapse of time, however long, cannot tend to obliterate, for those scholars, like Max Muller, Jones and Wilson have all left behind them monuments of learning and research in their editions of Sanskrit works and their translations which have gone out to the wide world for appreciation. It is all the same barely consistent with that expression of thankfulness that as time progresses and new material emerges, scholars should exercise their thoughts on questions on which there may be a possibility for review and reconsideration. Among such subjects is this topic of the Greek synchronism. The fancy that dawned in the mind of William Jones, was hatched by Wilford, was reared by Max Muller, was well clothed by Vincent Smith with the garb of reality. The dissent of Taylor expressed in the preface to *Rājataranginī* was lost to view before the modern ideas of A. Stein in his new Edn. of that work, and so too went down the feeble protest of Wilson.

98. To my lamented friend, T. S. Narayana Sastri, High Court Vakil, Madras, with whom I collaborated, was due a categorical investigation of this faulty identification and his *Age of Saṅkara* and *The kings of Magadha* embodied the results of our research. Then followed a similar exposition of Śrī Kalyāṇananda Sarasvatī of Virṇpākṣa Mutt and an address to an Oriental Conference by M. K. Acharya. Now comes my reiteration. It may not be a forelorn hope that, as I said, at some day or in some clime these thoughts may again have a revival and a recognition. Let me repeat the words of Bhavabhūti :

ये नाम काचिदिह नः प्रथयन्त्यवज्ञां जानन्ति ते किमपि तान् प्रति नैष यतनः ।  
उत्पत्स्यते मम तु कोऽपि समानधर्मा कालो ह्ययं निरवधिर्विपुला च पृथ्वी ॥

These prefatory pages will now introduce the reader to the study of Classical Sanskrit Literature.

## Abbreviations

<i>AB</i>	...	Abhinava-Bhāraṭī of Abhinavagupta.
<i>AG</i>	...	Cunningham's Ancient Geography.
<i>Ayar</i>	...	Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Adyar Library
<i>CAL</i>	...	
<i>Annals</i>	...	Annals of Bhandarkar Research Institute, Poona.
<i>ASL</i>	...	Max Muller's Ancient Sanskrit Literature.
<i>BP</i>	...	Bhāvaprakāśana of Śāradāṭanaya.
<i>BRI.</i>	...	Mss. in Bhandarkar Research Institute, Poona.
<i>BOD</i>	...	Catalogus Codicum Sanscriticorum Bibliotheca Bodli- nae
<i>Cat. Bod.</i>	..	
<i>Oxf</i>	...	
<i>Bibl. Ind.</i>	...	Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta.
<i>BKR</i>	...	Buhler's Kashmir Report.
<i>KR</i>	...	
<i>BSS</i>	...	Bombay Sanskrit Series.
<i>B</i>	...	A Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts contained in the Private Libraries of Guzarat, Kathiavad, Kachchh, &c. compiled under the superintendence of G. Buhler.
<i>Bik</i>	...	A catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in the library of the Mahārāja of Bikneer, compiled Rajendra Lala Mitra, Calcutta.
<i>Bhr</i>	..	Report on the search for Sanskrit Mss. in the Bombay Presidency by R. G. Bhandarkar.
<i>BR</i>	...	
<i>Burnell</i>	...	A classified index to the Sanskrit Mss. in the Palace at Tanjore by A. C. Burnell, London.
<i>BTC</i>	...	
<i>CC I, II, III.</i>	...	Aufrecht's Catalogus Catalogorum, Pts. 1, 2, 3, Leipzig.
<i>CSC</i>	...	Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Sanskrit College, Calcutta.
<i>COJ</i>	...	Calcutta Oriental Journal.
<i>CUS</i>	...	Columbia University—Indo-Iranian series.
<i>CII</i>	...	Corpus Ins. Indicarum.
<i>CAL</i>	...	Catalogue of manuscripts in Adyar Library.
<i>Adyar</i>	...	
<i>CASB</i>	...	Catalogue of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
<i>Cat. CP</i>	...	Hiralal's Catalogue of Manuscripts in Central Provinces.

<i>DR</i>	...	Ḍaśarūpa of Ḍhananjanaya.
<i>DC</i>	...	Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras.
<i>EI</i>	...	Epigraphica Indica.
<i>EHI</i>	...	V. Smith's Early History of India.
<i>EH</i>	...	
<i>EHD</i>	...	R. G. Bhandarkar's Early History of the Deccan.
<i>EC</i>	...	Epigraphica Carnatica.
<i>Gough</i>	...	A. E. Gough's Records of Ancient Sanskrit Literature.
<i>GOS</i>	...	Gaekwad Oriental series, Baroda.
<i>HOS</i>	...	Harward University Oriental Series.
<i>HR</i>	...	Reports on Sanskrit manuscripts in S. India by E. Hultzsch, Madras 1905.
<i>HZ</i>	...	
<i>ISI.</i>	...	Indisch Strahlen.
<i>IAlt.</i>	...	Indisch Alterthumskunde, Leipsig.
<i>IA</i>	...	Indian Antiquary.
<i>IL</i>	...	Indian Literature.
<i>IO</i>	...	Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in the India Office, London by Eggeling.
<i>IOC</i>	...	
<i>IW</i>	...	Monier William's Indian Wisdom.
<i>IHQ</i>	...	Indian Historical Quarterly.
<i>Ind. Rev.</i>	...	Indian Review, Madras.
<i>JA</i>	...	Journal Asiatique, Paris.
<i>JAHS</i>	...	Journal of Andhra Historical Society.
<i>JAOS</i>	...	Journal of the American Oriental Society.
<i>JASSP</i>	...	Andhara Sahitya Parishat Patrika.
<i>JASB</i>	...	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
<i>JBRAS</i>	...	do. (Bombay Branch).
<i>JSSP</i>	...	Journal of Samskrita Sahitya Parishat, Calcutta.
<i>JDL</i>	...	Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta.
<i>JOR</i>	...	Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.
<i>JRAS</i>	...	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
<i>JMy</i>	...	Journal of Mythic Society, Bangalore.
<i>Jess.</i>	...	Catalogue of Manuscripts in Jessalmere Library. (G. O. Series).
<i>Jess. Cat.</i>	...	
<i>Kcd</i>	...	Kaṇḍracandrodaya.
<i>Keith's SD</i>	...	A. B. Keith's Sanskrit Drama.
<i>Keith's CSL</i>	...	A. B. Keith's Classical Sanskrit Literature.
<i>Keith's SL</i>	...	A. B. Keith's Sanskrit Literature.
<i>Kav.</i>	...	F. W. Thomas Edn. of Kaṇḍravacanasaṃuccaya.
<i>Krs.</i>	...	

# ABBREVIATIONS

cxlii

<i>K</i>	...	A Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts existing in the Central Provinces—Edited by Keilhorn, Nagpur.
<i>Kh</i>	...	Report on the search for Sanskrit manuscripts in the Bombay Presidency during the year 1880-1 by Keilhorn, Bombay 1881. 8.
<i>l. c.</i>	...	{ ( <i>lico citato</i> )—‘in the passage previously cited.’
<i>loc. cit.</i>	...	
<i>L</i>	...	Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts by Rajendralala Mitra.
<i>Mitra</i>	...	
<i>Mack</i>	...	Mackenzie Collection. A descriptive catalogue of the Oriental Manuscripts collected by the late Lieut. Col. Colin Mackenzie by H. H. Wilson, Calcutta.
<i>Manj JI</i>	...	Manjūṣa, Sanskrit Journal, Calcutta.
<i>MBh JI</i>	...	Manjubhāṣiṇī, Sanskrit Journal, Kanci (Conjeevaram).
<i>MG-JI</i>	...	Mitragosthī, Sanskrit Journal, Calcutta.
<i>MM</i>	...	A descriptive catalogue of manuscripts in Mithila by K. Jayaswal.
<i>MV JI</i>	...	Maḍharavāṇī, Sanskrit Journal, Belgaum.
<i>MI</i>	...	C. V. Vaidya's Mediaeval India.
<i>Myr. OML</i>	...	Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in Oriental Library, Mysore and Supplement.
<i>Mys</i>	...	
<i>Mys Sup</i>	...	
<i>Mitra</i>	...	Notices of Sanskrit Manuscripts.
<i>Mod. Rev.</i>	...	Modern Review, Calcutta.
<i>MR</i>	...	
<i>ND</i>	...	Nāṭyaḍarpaṇa of Rāmacandra.
<i>NW</i>	...	A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Private Libraries of the North-West Provinces, Benares and Allahabad.
<i>NP</i>	...	
<i>Nepal Cat.</i>	...	Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in Nepal.
<i>Nepal</i>	...	
<i>Oudh</i>	...	Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts existing in Oudh.
<i>Oxf.</i>	...	Catalogue Codicum Sanscriticorum Bibliothecæ Bodleianæ by Aufrecht, Oxoniæ, 1864.
<i>Bod.</i>	...	
<i>Cat. Bod.</i>	...	
<i>op. cit.</i>	...	{ ( <i>opere citato</i> )—‘in the work cited.’
<i>o. c.</i>	...	
<i>Oppert</i>	...	Lists of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Private Libraries in Southern India by Gustav Oppert, 2 Vols. Madras.
<i>Opp.</i>	...	
<i>OML</i>	...	Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras.
<i>Pdym</i>	...	Paḍyāṃṣṭaṭaraṅgiṇī.
<i>Pmt</i>	...	

- Pady* ... Paḍyaveṇi.  
*PR* ... Peterson's Reports of the operations in search of Sanskrit Mss. in the Bombay Circle (I to IV).  
*Raj* ... Kalahaṇa's Rājataranginī.  
*RS* ... Rasārṇavasudhākara of Singabhūpāla.  
*Rgh* ... Report on search of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Bombay Presidency by B. G. Bhandarkar.  
*Rsj* ... Rasikajīvana.  
*Rice* ... Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Mysore and Coorg by Lewis Rice, Bangalore.  
*Radh* ... Pustakanam Śucipatram of the library of Pandit Radhakrishna of Lahore used by Aufrecht.  
*SB JI* ... Samskr̥ta Bhāraṭī, Sanskrit Journal, Calcutta.  
*SC JI* ... Samskr̥ta-candrikā, Sanskrit Journal Kolhapur.  
*SMM JI* ... Samskr̥ta-mahā-maṇḍala, Calcutta.  
*SD* ... Sāhityaḍarpaṇa of Viśvanāṭha.  
*SK* ... Sarasvatīkanthābharṇa of Bhoja.  
*ŚP* ... Śṛṅgāraprakāśa of Bhoja.  
*SP* ... Sanskrit Poetics by S. K. De.  
*SS* ... Śūktisundara.  
*SHar* ... Subhāṣitāhārāvali.  
*Smt* ... Śūktimukṭāvali.  
*Sah* ... Sahādaya, Sanskrit Journal, Madras.  
*Sam* ... Samvat Era.  
*Schuyler, Bibl.* A Bibliography of the Sanskrit Drama by Montgomery Schuyler (Columbia University, Indo-Iranian Series).  
*SKC* ...  
*KC* ... } Catalogue of Manuscripts in Kashmir.  
*Stein* ... }  
*Subh* ... Subhāṣitāvali of Vallabhaḍeva. Ed. by Peterson.  
*Śang* ... Śāraṅgaḍharapaddhaṭi.  
*SSG* ... Belvalkar's Systems of Sanskrit Grammar.  
*SR* ... Seshagiri Sastri's Reports, 2 Volumes.  
*SVH* ... Sources of Vizianagar History, Madras.  
*Skri* ... Saḍuktikarṇāmṛta of Śīḍharaḍāsa.  
*SPV* ... Samskr̥ta-Paḍyavāṇi, Sanskrit Journal, Calcutta.  
*SB* ... Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Sanskrit College Library, Benares, Allahabad.  
*Sury JI* ... Sūryodaya, Sanskrit Journal, Kāsi.

<i>TC</i>	... Triennial Cat. of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Oriental Library, Madras (I to VII).
<i>Tani</i>	... Catalogue of manuscripts in the Palace Library, Tanjore by P. P. S. Sastri.
<i>TSS</i>	... Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, Travancore.
<i>Trav</i>	... Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Travancore.
<i>Taylor</i>	... A Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts in the Library of the (late) College, Fort Saint George. By the Rev. William Taylor.
<i>TI</i>	... S. Levi's Theatre Indian.
<i>Ulwar</i>	... Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Ulwar State.
<i>VOJ</i>	... Vienna Oriental Journal.
<i>VCJl</i>	... Vijnānacintāmani, Sanskrit Journal, Pattambi.
<i>Wilson's Theatre</i>	Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus, London.
<i>WZKM</i> (= <i>VOJ</i> )	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.
<i>ZDMG</i>	... Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft.





## Bibliography

- |                            |     |  |
|----------------------------|-----|--|
| Aiyar, R. S.               | ... | The Nayaks of Madura.  |
| Altekar, A. S.             | ... | The Rastrakutas and their times.                               |
| Bagchi, P. C.              | ..  | Sino Indica, 2 vols.   |
| Bali, U. N.                | ... | Ancient India.   |
|                            |     | Medieval India.  |
| Barna, K. L.               | ... | Early History of Kamarupa.                                     |
| Basak, R. G.               | ... | History of North Eastern India.                                |
| Bhagwat Datta              | ... | History of Vedic Literature, 2 vols.                           |
| Bhandarkar, R. G.          | ... | Early History of the Deccan down to the<br>Mahomedan conquest. |
|                            |     | A Peep into the Early History of India.                        |
| Bijanraj Chatterjee        | ... | Indian Culture in Java and Sumatra.                            |
| Bose, P. N.                | ... | Ancient Indian Colony in Siam.                                 |
| Chakravorthy, S. K.        | ... | A Story of Ancient Indian Numismatics.                         |
|                            |     | Ancient Indian Numismatics.                                    |
| Chakradhar H. C.           | ... | Social Life on Ancient India.                                  |
| Cunningham, Sir Alexander, | }   | Ancient Geography of India.                                    |
| Das, A. B.                 |     |  |
|                            | ... | Rig-vedic India.   |
|                            |     | Rig-vedic Culture.   |
| Dikshitar, V. R. R.        | ... | Some Aspects of Vayu Purana.                                   |
|                            |     | " " Matsya Purana.   |
| Deneschandra Sarcar        | ... | Dynastic History of Northern India.                            |
| Dineschandar Sen           | ... | Vaishnava Literature of Mediaeval Bengal.                      |
|                            |     | History of Bengali Language and Literature.                    |
| Duff, C. M.                | ... | Chronology of India, Westminster.                              |
| Dutt, R. C.                | ... | Civilization in Ancient India, 2 vols.                         |
| Edwin Arnold               | ... | Indian Poetry and Indian Idylls.                               |
| Farquhar                   | ... | Outlines of the Religious Literature of India.                 |
| Fausball                   | ... | Indian Mythology.  |
| Frazer, R. W.              | ... | A Literary History of India, London and<br>New York.           |
| Gopalan, R.                | ... | Pallavas of Kanci.   |
| Henry, Victor              | ... | Les Literatures de l'Inde, Paris.                              |

- Heras, H. ... Beginnings of Vijayanagara History.  
The Aravidu dynasty of Vijayanagar.  
Studies in Pallava History.  
The Pallava Geneology.
- Jayaswal, K. P. ... History of India (150 A.D. 350 A.D.)
- Jones, J. P. ... India—Its life and Thought.
- Krishnaswami Aiyangar S. ... A Little Known Chapter of Vizianagar History.  
A Short History of Hindu India.  
Early History of Vaishnavism in South India.  
Hindu India from Original Sources.  
Studies in Gupta History.
- Kulkarni, K. P. ... Sanskrit Drama and Dramatists.  
Tales from Sanskrit Dramatists.
- Law, B. C. ... Ancient mid-Indian Kshatriya Tribes  
Ancient Tribes of India.  
Historical Gleanings.
- Lassen, Christian ... Indische Alterthumskunde, Leipzig.
- Macdonell, Arthur, A. ... History of Sanskrit Literature, London and New York.
- Mc Crindle, J. W. ... Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian.  
Ancient India as described by Ptolemy.
- Majumdar, R. C. ... Ancient Indian Colonies in Far East, Vol. I  
Champa.  
Outlines of Ancient Indian History and Civilization.
- Majumdar, A. K. ... The Hindu History (3003 B.C. 1200 A.D.)
- Manning, Mrs. C. S. ... Ancient and Mediæval India, London.
- Mitra, P. ... Pre-Historic India.
- Moraes, G. M. ... Kadambakula—A History of Ancient and Mediæval Karnataka, Bombay.
- Mukerjee, P. K. ... Indian Literature Abroad (China).  
Indian Literature in China and the Far East.
- Nandu Lal Dey ... Geographical Dictionary of Ancient and Mediæval India.  
Rasatal or The Underworld.
- Oldenberg, N. ... Die Literature des alten Indian, Stuttgart and Berlin.
- Panikkar, K. M. ... Sri Harscha of-Kanoj.

## cxi

- |                        |     |  |
|------------------------|-----|--|
| Pargiter, F. E.        | ... | Ancient Indian Historical Tradition.   |
| Pischel, R.            | ... | Die Indesche Literature, Berlin.   |
| Pires, E. A.           | ... | The Maukharis.   |
| Rapson                 | ... | Ancient India.<br>Ancient India (Cambridge).<br>History of India.  |
| Radhakrishna Mukerjee. |     | Fundamental Units of India.  |
| Sarma, S. H.           | ... | Padma Purana.  |
| Sen and Ray Choudhri.  |     | The Germination of Indian History.   |
| Siddhata, M. K.        | ... | Heroic Age of India.   |
| Siddhesvara Sastri     | ... | Pracina Caritra Kosa.<br>Dictionary of Ancient Indian Biographies.   |
| Sitanath Pradhan       | ... | Chronology of Ancient India (from the Times<br>of the Rig-veda, King Devadasa to Chan-<br>dragupta Maurya.   |
| Sitanath Tatvabhushan. |     | Krishna and Purana.  |
| Smith, V. A.           | ... | The Early History of India (from 600 B.C.)<br>till Mahomedan conquest,<br>Oxford History of India.<br>Asoka. |
| Vaidya, C. V.          | ... | History of Mediæval Hindu India—3 Vols.<br>History of Vedic Literature.                                      |
| Von Schordder, L.      | ... | Indian Literature and Kultur, Leipzig.   |
| Weber, A.              | ... | Indian Literature.   |
| Williams, Monier       | ... | Indian Wisdom.   |
| Winternitz, M.         | ... | Der Indeschen Literature, 2 vols. Leipzig.<br>Some Problems of Indian Literature.                            |